THE

Scripture Doctrine

OF THE

Most Holy and Undivided

TRINITY,

VINDICATED

From the Misinterpretations of Dr. CLARKE.

To which is prefixed a LETTER to the Reverend DOCTOR,

BY

ROBERT NELSON, Esq;

LONDON:

Printed for RICHARD SMITH at Bishop *Beveridge*'s Head in *Pater-Noster-Row.* MDCCXIV.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

To the Reverend

Dr. CLARKE, *Rector*

OF

St. *James's, Weſtminſter.*

Reverend SIR,

I SHOULD not have given you the Trouble of this Addreſs, if my Worthy and Learned Friend, the Author of the following Treatiſe, *concerning the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, &c.* could have been prevailed upon to have put his Name to it. If I miſtake not, it is written with all thoſe Qualifications, which you in your *Introduction* require except that one; which is alſo altogether extrinſick to its

true Value, and is (if it be a Fault) the moſt eaſie of all to pardon, ſince no body but himſelf can be the Loſer by it. But his Modeſty and Humility being of a Piece with his Learning and Piety, which are confined by no common Bounds, he contents himſelf with the Satisfaction of maintaining and defending a good Cauſe, without reaping that juſt Applauſe, which reſults from the Judicious Management of it. You will find the whole Compoſure governed by *a Spirit of Chriſtianity*, and not by a *Spirit of Papery* or Perſecution. And if any one be not *favourable* to the Argument, or ſatisfied with his and the Church's Reaſons for the *Common Faith*, at leaſt the Learning and Candor with which he treats it, may, I am

per-

perſuaded command no *unfavourable* Reception.

There is nothing for certain more commendable in any Writer, than Candor and Sincerity, without perplexing the Queſtion with a multitude of Proofs, but little or nothing to the Purpoſe, and drawing in Authors and Authorities, to ſpeak that which we are certain enough they could never mean: And nothing undoubtedly is more neceſſary to guide our Judgment, in diſtinguiſhing what is the *Scripture Doctrine* in any Point, whether it be an *Article* of *Faith*, or a *leſs neceſſary Truth* only, than a good Underſtanding of the *Original Revelation* it ſelf, and of the beſt and moſt ancient *Interpreters* thereof. Theſe our Learned Author poſſeſſes in great Perfection; and

though he hath not the Honour and Happineſs of waiting at the Altar; yet he truly reſpects your Order, and above all values the Sacred *Depoſitum* to you committed; neither doth he want Talents and Endowments to diſtinguiſh him, even if he were admitted into the Sacred Function; and therefore I hope you will not neglect to conſider what he offers upon this Subject, though it comes from a Lay-Man, whoſe great Ambition is to lie concealed.

I muſt confeſs, I have had the following Papers by me above ſix Months, but I ſtill deferred the Publication, in hopes the Author might have been perſuaded to have owned them himſelf; but ſince no Intreaties can ſhake the Reſolution he hath taken of continuing unknown,

known, I thought I ought not to detain them any longer from the Service of the Publick, for the ſake of ſome uncommon Remarks in them. And the Reverend Doctor *Wells*, having conſidered your *Introduction*, and offered ſeveral things, in reſpect to the General Deſign and Plan of your Book, which will be thought by many not unworthy your Notice; it was not only my Opinion, but that of others alſo whom I conſulted, That theſe Learned Remarks on the *Book* it ſelf, would very properly follow what that Learned Doctor hath obſerved upon the *Introduction*. That ſo this whole Matter may be ſifted into according as it deſerveth, and the Evidence of Truth may determine it for the ſtrongeſt Side; which is all the End that I here-

in propose to my self, that so God may be glorified in his Church by the Profession of a True Faith.

If you find the Observations and Remarks of my Learned Friend well grounded, you will do your Self and the Truth the greatest Honour, in receiving them according to the *Intrinsick* Weight they bear; and if they be not thus grounded, it will be a Piece of Justice due to the Publick, to undeceive those who may differ from you in their Opinion concerning his manner of treating those Texts, which have been alledged by you in favour of your *Hypothesis*, as distinguished from the received Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in Her *Articles* and *Offices*.

You will not, I believe, be able to fix upon him the

Character of a Deſpicable and *Careleſs Writer*, when you ſhall ſet about a Re-examination of that Original Revelation, both of the Old and New Teſtament, which is the true and undoubted Standard to go by in this Diſpute. I have the Hopes, you will fully diſcharge the Promiſe, with which you have bound your ſelf, and which the CHURCH, which hath been ſo kind to you, hath a Right to expect. There are about Forty Texts, upon which the main Streſs of your Theory depends that are here examined; and being tried according to the *Catholick Expoſition*, are vindicated for the Church by an able Scripturiſt, who hath applied the Rules of Criticiſm, not *againſt* but *for* the

the Faith, of which the *Catholick* Church is in Poſſeſſion.

When I had occaſion to mention your Name in the Life of Biſhop *Bull*, and thereupon to take notice, of your late Celebrated Performance, touching the *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ſo far as the Honour of that Great Man did ſeem to be concerned; I did not think I ſhould ever trouble the World or You again upon this Head. And though, as you know, I have with your ſelf been publickly animadverted upon, by a very Zealous and Learned Divine in our Church, for not coming up to his Meaſures of Orthodoxy; and cenſured for that very Part of this Good Biſhop's Life, in which you are more particularly concerned, as if I there ſhewed my ſelf too

too favourable to you and your Doctrine, and made too near Approaches towards *Arianiſm*, though even by following that Great Defender of the *Nicene Faith*, of whoſe Writings I was there giving an Hiſtorical Account. However, I choſe rather to bear the Cenſure paſſed upon me, without ſaying one Word for my ſelf, but leaving my Readers to judge, as they ſhould ſee Reaſon, either for or againſt me, than to enter beyond my Depth, or preſume to intermeddle with the Diſcuſſion of ſo venerable a Myſtery of our Religion as this, of which I can by no means think my ſelf or any other obliged to have a full and adequate Idea : Notwithſtanding I was thus invited by your and my Animadverter, or rather chal-

challenged to defend Biſhop *Bull* and my ſelf, and to adventure the loſing my ſelf in the τὰ βάθη τῆ Θεῦ, when the Part of an *Hiſtorian* did only belong to me, and there wanted not Able Divines enough in our Church, I was ſure, to vindicate the Truth of the Scripture Doctrine, concerning the Object of our Worſhip, *as it was* underſtood and believed *in the beginning, is now, and*, I truſt, *ever ſhall be*.

If I have diſcharged the Part of an Hiſtorian faithfully, in the Accounts which I have given, I have done my Duty, and what I undertook. And of this you were very ſenſible, when you were pleaſed to expreſs your ſelf to me with ſo much Candor and Ingenuity upon that Subject. It was not with-

in

in my Province, as ſuch, to debate thoſe Scholaſtical and Critical Points, in which ſome Great Maſters of Controverſy have loſt themſelves. And I never thought that it would have been expected by any, that in an Hiſtory, I ſhould have entered into the Detail of the abſtruſeſt Queſtions, or have diſcuſſed the various Acceptations of ſuch Terms, as I had occaſion to uſe after Great Men, who had taken them in the ſame Senſe before me. Not engaging my ſelf therefore farther, I ſhall account it no ſmall Satisfaction to find, that what I there advanced hath not been altogether without Fruit; if it may have given, at leaſt an Hint to Men of more Learning and

Leiſure, either to correct what I have ſaid, or to carry the Matter further, and very accurately to examine thoſe Weights and Meaſures, which are to determine us in this Grand Queſtion now before us.

To the Goſpel and to the Teſtimony the Appeal is made, and there let it be determined. You have taken very much Pains in the Search; and others alſo have been at no leſs, who cannot yet be ſatisfied with yours. We muſt all however, commend the Deſign of tracing the Originals of our moſt Holy Faith, with Candor and Impartiality; and of moſt ſtrictly cleaving to the ſincere Revelation of Divine Truth. And far be it from me, to derogate

in

in the leaſt from any Service you may have formerly done to the Cauſe of Religion, whether Natural or Revealed; or to leſſen any Part of thoſe Solid Merits, which are and muſt be confeſſed to be in you, even by thoſe who are otherwiſe very different from you; I mean eſpecially as touching this deep Article, which will for ever continue to puzzle all the Diſputers of this World.

But I could heartily have now wiſhed, That we of the Laity had no ſuch Handle ever given us, as this your laſt Book hath afforded, as it is to be feared, but to too many, who think themſelves able to overturn any Foundations whatſoever, if ſuch a Method,

as

as you there propose be allowable, with respect to the most Solemn Acts and Deeds of that Church and Community whereof we are Members, and to substitute what they please in their Room. It cannot be denied, but that your Method hath a plausible Appearance at the first View, and that you have said as much as is possible for the setting it off, and recommending it to your Reader. But it is no less undeniable, that a considerable Advantage hath been thence made, by the Enemies of our Peace at this Time, whether with or without Reason I do not say, and that our Church, both as to Doctrine and Worship, hath by this Means been very much traduced, and even triumphed over

over by our Adverſaries of ſeveral Sorts and Denominations.

Now if your Syſtem, which you have drawn out in many more Propoſitions than we have Articles, be indeed the true Scripture Syſtem ; it will be doubtleſs our Duty to renounce ſo far the Doctrine and Worſhip of our Church, as it is inconſiſtent with your ſaid Propoſitions, and immediately to ſet about a new and thorough Reformation ; leſt while we tax the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, we our ſelves ſhould at the ſame time be found guilty of it in our common Devotions, and in our moſt Solemn Acts of Communion ; and that ſo much the more unpardonably, as that no heavier Charge

can be laid againſt that corrupt Church for a Ground of our Separation, than that of Idolatry, as it hath been managed by the late moſt Learned Biſhop *Stillingfleet*. But if otherwiſe, and this your Syſtem, after a moſt ſtrict and elaborate Examination of it, be found no more conſiſtent with the Scripture, than it is with the received Doctrine and Worſhip of our Church; then it will be doubtleſs our Duty, to continue ſtedfaſtly our Adherence to ſuch Doctrine and Worſhip, according as the ſame is delivered to us from the Scriptures by our firſt Reformers, That is in the Senſe which *the Catholick Fathers and Primitive Biſhops have thence collected.* And I am willing to hope, that in the Learned

Learned Dr. *Clarke*, there will be found ſo much of Chriſtian Sincerity and Candor, as may oblige him by his own Example to approve of this Procedure; to juſtify the Rule which they have given us, and he hath commended, to prevent the overturning of Foundations both Sacred and Civil, with which we are threatned from a Method of this Nature; and to endeavour to heal again thoſe Wounds of his Mother the Church, which this Book of his may have given Her, and which ſo many of his Brethren loudly complain of, as if She had received them, not from an Enemy but from a Friend.

But whatever may be ſaid, either for or againſt this Syſtem of yours, and with whatever Mind it was by you publiſhed, thus much is certain and fixed; That according to the beſt of our Capacity, we are obliged, if we would avoid running into Hereſy and Error, to *have Recourſe to the Rule it ſelf*, and alſo to take in *the beſt Helps* for the underſtanding this Rule. And it is no leſs certain, that either by not having Recourſe to the *Original Revelation* it ſelf, which is the *Rule*, or by neglecting the *beſt Helps* for the Interpretation of it which we are capable of uſing, there is the greateſt Danger of falling into ſome Miſtake; and generally ſo much the more, as the Enquirer is a Perſon of brighter Parts than

than ordinary, yea if he be never ſo little above the common Level. And if the Judges, and others Learned in the Law, ſhall follow the ſame Method of interpreting the Laws of the Land, and accommodating the Civil Oaths and Engagements, as you have taken in interpreting and accommodating the Senſe of the Church, in her moſt Authentick Forms and Declarations before God and Man, and of the Venerable Fathers of the *Catholick* Church; there are many of the Opinion, that every Thing might eaſily be leaped over, and that no Eſtabliſhment could be ſo ſtrong as to laſt long.

Which being conſidered it is preſumed that you cannot take it amiſs, if this be a little far-

ther enquired into, for the ſake of what is ſo dear to your ſelf; for who knows, whereabouts his Religion, Liberty or Property may be, if ſuch a Latitude of Interpretation be defenſible as is avouched in your Third Part openly, and is therefore ſuſpected in your Firſt and Second. This will deſerve to be ſet to rights.

It is very juſtly by you obſerved, That this Matter, which is of the greateſt Importance, ought not to be *treated of ſlightly and careleſsly*; for I fully agree with you, that it ought to be *examined thoroughly on all Sides, by a ſerious ſtudy of the whole Scripture, and by taking care that the Explication be conſiſtent with it ſelf in every Part.* And certainly the Deſign of di-

geſting

geſting with Care and Pains under proper Heads the Texts of Scripture which relate to this Doctrine, is very commendable; and then drawing up a Scheme of the whole, and reducing and explaining it, in a great Number of particular and diſtinct Propoſitions. And if indeed, according to the *Weight and Dignity of the Subject, you have conſidered it throughout as carefully and diſtinctly as you was able*; there is no ſufficient Reaſon in my Opinion, for any Learned Perſon, who may think you miſtaken, to treat You angrily, *and in the Spirit of Popery*, as if we were not *to uſe our own Underſtandings* in Matters of *Religion*, as well as in other Matters; but *muſt always plead for what Notions happen at any time to pre-*

vail, as if they were therefore true, becauſe they prevail.

However, SIR, You know there is an Apoſtolical Injunction, that we ſhould *earneſtly contend for the Faith*; and if the Divine Oeconomy of FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, in the Unity of the Divine Eſſence, which is taught us by our Excellent Church, in her moſt Publick and Authentick Acts, and is the *Common Faith* both of Proteſtants and Papiſts, or the *Common Salvation* as delivered in all the Churches Reformed and Unreformed, ſhould be that Faith which was *once delivered unto* (or *by*) *the Saints*; you muſt not be diſturbed if ſome, who have purſued Truth by the ſame Methods you have done,

done, do *earneſtly contend* againſt you, in a Matter of ſo high a Nature, where they apprehend you to be miſtaken after all the painful Search you have made; and not to have repreſented the true *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, but to have ſubſtituted in its room another of your own; againſt the true Apoſtolical Tradition of that Doctrine, and the common Interpretation of the Scriptures throughout All the Ages of the Church of Chriſt.

If it ſhould be thus, I ſay, as ſome, whoſe Learning and Piety are unqueſtionable, and who alſo have ſpared no Pains in the Reſearch, do apprehend and aſſert; in this Caſe an *Earneſt Contention* for the Catholick Faith, and for the Revelation

of

of God as generally underſtood in the Church, where there is oppoſed to it no more than a *private Interpretation* of Scripture, ſhould (if not commended at leaſt) not be preſently and altogether condemned, though it may not ſeem to you written with all that *Spirit of Meekneſs*, which you have laid in your claim for, in whomſoever ſhall appear againſt your Explication. Indeed it is much to be wiſhed that the *Spirit of Meekneſs and Chriſtianity* did more univerſally influence the Management of all our Diſputes both Religious and Civil; which I conceive may be very conſiſtent with an Holy and Humble Zeal for God's Glory and the Defence of the Chriſtian Revelation; and with an earneſt Contention for all the

Great

Great Truths thereof, by the Word of God and the Teſtimony of his Saints, even ſuch as were the Greateſt Lights of the Church in the earlieſt and pureſt Ages of it. To a fuller Diſcovery of theſe important Points if the following Papers may any ways contribute, you will not be diſpleaſed, I am confident, with the Application which is made to you by

Reverend SIR,

Your moſt Faithful

Novem. 16. 1713. *Humble Servant,*

ROB. NELSON.

Great Truths thereof, by the
Word of God and the Testimony
of his Saints, even such as were
the Greatest Lights of the
Church in the earliest and pu-
rest Ages of it. To a fuller
Discovery of these important
Points the following Papers
may any ways contribute, you
will not be displeased, I am con-
fident, with the Application
which is made to you by

Reverend SIR,

Your most Faithful

Humble Servant,

ROB. NELSON.

THE PREFACE.

PERhaps the Reader may wonder, ſince Jeſus Chriſt is the End of the Law, and Moſes and the Prophets are every where full of his Sacred Perſon, that there is little cited out of the Old Teſtament for a Proof of his Divinity in the following Obſervations; eſpecially ſince it is reaſonable to believe, That in ſo frequent a Mention of Him as there occurs, ſomething muſt be dropped in ſeveral Places in relation to his Godhead, as a proper Preparative for the greater Light of the Goſpel Diſpenſation. But the Truth is, The Learned Dr. having confined his Enquiries to the New Teſtament, gave little Occaſion of making Excurſions into the Writings of the Old; tho' I am well ſatisfied from thoſe Writings themſelves, from the Citations of the Apoſtles, and from the Interpretations of the Antients, that there is a rich Treaſure of Divine Authorities contained in them, which, giving and receiving Light from the New, are an able Witneſs

of

of the great Myſtery of the Son of God, in the hand of a Scribe that is well inſtructed to the Kingdom of Heaven, and knows, like the Houſholder, the Time and Manner of bringing into View both the New and the Old, for the Profit and Pleaſure of thoſe that are entertained by Him.

As for the Citations out of the Fathers, there would have been little Need of them, had there been any Certainty that the Doctor's Preface would have been always read with the Performance following it, or always remember'd: But for fear, leſt the Contradiction charged on theſe good old Men might not haply occur to the Reader's Mind, in weighing the Paſſages which the Dr. alledges, and their whole Writings might ſuffer Damage, and be judg'd of a Piece with the Senſe impos'd on thoſe few Paſſages. I have made it my Endeavour, to ſhew in ſome Inſtances, the little Ground which the Dr. had for placing thoſe Authors on the ſide of his Opinion; being verily perſuaded, that ſuch as are cited in theſe following Papers, give great Light to the Doctrine of our Church, and confirm its Antiquity, as deduced from Scripture.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I. Pag.

OF GOD the FATHER. 1

CHAP. II.

Of the SON of GOD. 43

CHAP. III.

Of the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD. 112

ERRATA.

PAG.	Line	read
5.	7.	*the* ;
14.	21.	r. *Godhead* ;
25.	*ult.*	r. *Tit.* ii.
54.	9.	r. μισεῖται.
88.	3.	r. Θεῷ.
116.	12.	r. *de Patt.*
121.	24.	r. v. 5.

THE Scripture Doctrine OF THE *TRINITY*, &c.

CHAP. I.

Of GOD the FATHER.

I. MATT. xix. 17. *There is none* good *but* One, (εἷς, *one* * *Being*) *that is, God.*

* There is no neceſſity for rendring the Word εἷς, by *One Perſon*, as the learned Dr. ſuppoſes; ſince it may be as well

well or better done by *One Being*. For *One* (εἷς) is Maſculine, by reaſon of its Relation to *God*, (Θεὸς;) and is no leſs fitted to repreſent *Being*, than it is *Perſon*; ſince they are neither of them Maſculine. After the like manner is εἷς uſed for *One Thing*, Galat. iii. 28. *for ye are all one* (εἷς) *in Chriſt Jeſus*; *not one Perſon*, for that is impoſſible; but *one Thing*, as the vulg. *Latin* reads it, *Omnes enim vos Unum eſtis in Chriſto Jeſu*; which *Jerom* explains thus.

You are all one Body of Chriſt; *Omnes unum Corpus eſtis Chriſti*. *Theodoret* ſays, The Term *One*, is τὸ εἷς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἓν σῶμα, uſed for *One Body*.

Theophyl. explains it, as we are καθὸ ἓν σωμά ἐσμεν, all *One Body*.

And doubtleſs the *Greeks* were proper Judges of their own Language. If then *One* (εἷς) ſignifies *one Thing* or *Body*, in the *Galatians*, Why may it not ſignifie *One Being* in St. *Matthew*? But after all, the Words might have been better rendred in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation, *There is none good but God alone*; as they are in the vulg. *Latin*, *Nemo bonus niſi ſolus Deus*, Luke xviii. 19. for ſo we render the very ſame Terms, εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεὸς, in *Mark* ii. 7.

Who

Who can forgive Sins but God only? Which the vulg. *Latin* confirms, *niſi ſolus Deus*; and is juſtified by the Parallel place, *Luke* v. 21. which puts μόνος in the place of εἷς, *Who can forgive Sins but God alone?* εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς; which puts an end to the Criticiſm of Perſonality founded upon the Term εἷς.

II. *Mark* xii. 29. The firſt of all the Commandments is; Hear O *Iſrael*, the Lord (*Jehovah*) our God, the Lord (*Jehovah*) is † *One*, (or the * *only one*, that is, the only God.)

† So the *Hebrew* and *Greek* read it.

* The term *One* is uſed in this excluſive Senſe in the Old Teſtament, out of which the Paſſage is cited; as for inſtance, what we render, *and that Man periſhed not alone in his Iniquity*, Joſh. xxii. 20. is in the *Hebrew*, *and that* (*a*) *one Man periſhed not in his Iniquity*; and is paraphraſed thus in the *Alexandrian* Manuſcript, (*b*) *and tho' this one Man was alone, yet He periſhed not alone in his Sin*; and in the following Sentence, *I called Him alone*, Iſaiah li. 2. the Term *alone* is the rendring of

(a) אֶחָד

(b) Καὶ εἷς ἦν, μὴ μόνος ἔτος ἀπέθανεν, &c.

the *Hebrew Word* one. (See N° I.) now in this very Senſe is the *Lord our God* ſaid to be *One*, that is, excluſive of the Gods of the Nations, among whom the *Jews* were then Strangers, as the Text is explained *Zech.* xiv. 9. *in that Day ſhall the Lord* (or Jehovah) *be One*, (or the only God;) *and his Name One*, (or be only invoked) in oppoſition to *Idols*, and their *Names*, that were to be cut off from the Land, *c.* xiii. 2, which is confirmed by comparing *Deut.* vi. 4, whence the Text is taken, with *v.* 12, 14. for *Moſes* having inculcated Love and Fidelity to the *One and only God*, and enjoyned them the Methods of preſerving themſelves and their Children after them, in this Faith and Practice from *v.* 4. to *v.* 10. he proceeds to caution them from falling away from the *One God* to the Gods of the Nations that were round about them, when they ſhould come into the Land of thoſe Idolatrous People; which is done from *v.* 10. to *v.* 15. and ſhews, That *the Unity of the Godhead* and their adherence to him is taught and commanded in Oppoſition to the Multitude of falſe Gods, and the Worſhip paid them; and it is very probable that this *Unity* is generally, if not always, affirmed

firmed in the ſacred *Writings* in this excluſive Senſe, as oppoſed to the Multitude of falſe Gods.

As for the firſt Citation out of *Athanaſius cont. Gent.* p. 6. it is plain from the Context, that the Unity of tht Godhead affirmed in this Place, is not in Contradiſtinction to the Son; but to another unbegotten God or Principle, beſides the true One, conceived by ſome Hereticks to be the Author of Evil.

In the ſecond Citation out of his *Orat.* 3. *cont. Arian.* the Unity is aſſerted in like manner in Oppoſition, not to the Son, but to pretended Deities. For thus *Athanaſius* explains himſelf, §. 6. Theſe ſort of excluſive Terms are uſed not upon the account of the Son; but to deny the Exiſtence of any other Being, like the Father and his Word.

Οὐκοῦν ὁ δι' αὐτὸν (ὑὸν) εἴρηται, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἕτερον, οἷόν ἐστιν ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος.

And he affirms the Son in this very Place to be Co-eſſential with the Father.

Irenæus was of the ſame Mind with *Athanaſius*, concerning the excluſive

Terms, that they did not affect the Son, when he ſays,

Ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum verbo ſuo juſtè dicatur Deus & Dominus Solus. Lib. 3. c. 8.

That He, who made all things, is juſtly call'd with his *Word*, *The Only God and Lord.*

Including the Son in the *Only Lord God*, and not excluding him by the term *Only*. See N° v. and *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 18, 19.

III. Mark xii. 32. *There is † one God, and there is none other but He.*

† This referring to the foregoing Citation out of *Deut.* vi. 4. *The Lord our God, the Lord is One*, ſhews it muſt be underſtood in the ſame excluſive Senſe here, that is, in Oppoſition to *falſe Gods*; as appears from the following explicatory Sentence, *And there is none other but He*, which is ſpoken of the true God in Oppoſition to falſe Ones, *Deut.* xxxii. 37, 38, 39. *Iſai.* xlv. 20, 21. and therefore is not to be oppoſed to the Son. In which Senſe it is taken by *Tertullian*, who ſays,

There-

Therefore there is one God the Father, *and there is none other but He.* By which Inference *He* does not deny the Son, but *another God.*

Again, that He ſays, *there is no other God beſides himſelf*, Iſai. xlv. 5. is ſpoken in reſpect of *the Idolatry* of the *Gentiles* and of the *Jews.*

Again, I am God, *and there is none other beſides me*; Iſai. xlv. 21, Sept. He ſhews himſelf to be the only one, but in Union with *the Son.*

Igitur unus Deus Pater, & abſq; eo alius non eſt. *Quod ipſe inferens, non filium negat, ſed* alium Deum.

Itaq; præter ſemetipſum non eſſe alium Deum, *hoc propter* Idololatriam *tam nationum quam Iſraelis.*

Ego Deus, & abſq; me alius non eſt, *qui ſe* unicum, *ſed cum* Filio *oſtendit.* adv. Prax. c. 18.

Novatian follows him in the like Interpretation, And ſays of God the Father; Who ſays by the Prophet *Iſai.* xlv. 21. *Sept.* I am God, *and —there is none beſide me*; who ſays by the ſame Prophet, *Iſai.* xlviii. 11. I will not give my Glory unto another; that He may exclude all Heathens and

Qui dicit per Prophetam, Ego Deus, & non eſt præter me. *Qui per eundem Prophetam refert; Quoniam majeſtatem meam non dabo alteri, ut omnes cum* ſuis figmentis *Ethnicos excludat*

excludat & Hæreticos, cap. 3.

Hereticks with their *falſe Gods, or their own Inventions.*

Tho' then God the Father be αὐτόθεος, or ſuch who derives his Being and Godhead from no Cauſe; yet ſince the Terms *One God* are uſed in no ſuch Meaning in this place, but in oppoſition only to falſe Gods; they ought not to be confined to the Father alone, as excluſive of the Son: Neither, indeed, does *Athanaſius* ſo confine them in the Paſſage cited from him, under this Article, but includes the Son in *the One* God, ſaying,

Ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ καὶ Πρώτῳ καὶ μόνῳ, &c.

The Son alſo is in that (a) *One*, and *Firſt*, and *Only* God, *&c.*

And He tells us juſt before, that tho' the Father be the *One* and *Only* God, and the *Firſt*; yet that theſe Titles are not ſpoken of him in ſuch a manner, as to exclude the Son.

Εἷς γὰρ Θεὸς καὶ μόνος, καὶ πρωτός ἐστιν· οὐκ εἰς ἀναίρεσιν δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται.

(a) Ἕνα σέβομεν Θεὸν ——— τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν διεξαπίνομεν. We worſhip one God, who is both Father and Son. *Orig cont. Celſ. lib.* 8. *p.* 386.

And

And again, §. 8. of the ſame Oration.

Theſe and ſuch like excluſive Terms are not uſed on the Son's account to exclude Him, but falſe Gods only.

Οὐκ εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, οὐδὲ δι' αὐτὸν ἔξω τὰ τοιαῦτα ῥητά· ἀλλ' εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῶν ψεύδους.

V. John xvii. 3. *That they might know Thee the* † Only *true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom Thou haſt ſent.*

† The Term *Only*, does not always exclude every thing elſe but the Subject to which it is united; as *Eccluſ.* xxiv. 5. Wiſdom ſays of herſelf, *I alone* (μόνη) *compaſſed the Circuit of Heaven*; which ſurely does not exclude the Father, ſince *Job* ſays of *El ſchaddai*, or the Almighty God, a Name appropriated by the Modern *Arians* to the Father, *That He walketh in the Circuit of Heaven*: If then the Term *Only*, does not exclude the Father, we cannot neceſſarily infer that it does the Son. And indeed it is not underſtood to do ſo, as will appear from the following Authorities, that may be added to the foregoing N° II, III.

Si noluiſſet ſe etiam Deum intelligi, cur addidit, & quem miſiſti Jeſum Chriſtum, *niſi quoniam & Deum accipi voluit?——Sed Deo junxit, ut & Deum per hanc conjunctionem, ſic ut eſt, intelligi vellet. Eſt ergo credendum ſecundum præſcriptam regulam in Dominum unum verum Deum, & in eum quem miſit Jeſum Chriſtum conſequenter; qui ſe nequaquam Patri, ut diximus, junxiſſet, niſi Deum quoque intelligi vellet.* c. 24.

Novatian ſays, for if Chriſt would not have been thought God, why did He add, *and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*, except he had a Mind to be accounted *God?* But He joyned himſelf with God, that by this Union, He might be known to be God, as really He is; we muſt therefore believe, according to the foregoing Rule, in the Lord, the only true God, and by conſequence in Jeſus Chriſt whom He ſent: Who would never, as we have ſaid, have joyned himſelf with the Father, except He had been willing they ſhould have believed him to have been God.

Non intelligo quomodo nobis à Deo vero ſeparandus ad fidem ſit, qui non ſit ſeparabilis ad Sa-

I cannot conceive, ſays St. *Hilary*, how it is neceſſary to a right Faith to ſeparate the Son from *the true God*, who cannot be ſeparated

ſeparated from him in the Work of our Salvation.

Item. De Trin. Lib. 9. p. 69. Edit. *Pariſ.* 1572.

And again, The Faith of the Church, which confeſſes the Father to *be the only true God*, confeſſes the Son alſo.

Eccleſiæ fides ſolum verum Deum Patrem confeſſa, confitetur & Chriſtum.

He probably refers to the *Nicene* Creed, where He is called *very God of very God.*

St. *Ambroſe* ſays, The Evangeliſt in Writing thoſe Words of our Lord, *That they may know Thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom Thou haſt ſent*, has ſo united the Father and Son together by the Conjunction, that no one can ſeparate Chriſt *the True God* from the Majeſty of the Father; for a Conjunction never ſeparates.

Scribendo verba Domini, ut cognoſcant te ſolum verum Deum, & quem miſiſti Jeſum Chriſtum, *conjunctione illâ Patrem utique copulavit & Filium, ut Chriſtum verum Deum à Majeſtate Patris nemo ſecernat; nunquam enim conjunctio ſeparat.* De fid. Lib. 5. c. 2.

This

This Doctrine is evidently founded upon Scripture, in which the Son is called, *the true God and Eternal Life*, 1 John v. 20. for that this relates to the Son and not to the Father, is clear, not only from the Conſtruction itſelf, but from *Eternal Life* joyned with *the true God*, which is ſpoken of no Perſon in the preceding Part of the Epiſtle, but of the Son only; *vid. inf.* N° 410.

To what purpoſe then was the excluſive Term *Only* added, if the Son be *true God*? it was in oppoſition to Idols and falſe Gods.

Ὁ ἀληθινὸς πρὸς τὰς ψευδεῖς ἀντιδιατιθέμενος λέγεται· adv. Eunom. Lib. 4. p. 106.

So ſays St. *Baſil*, He is called *true* in oppoſition to falſe Gods.

Ἀλλ' οἶμαι τὸ μόνῳ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει λέγεσθαι τῶν ὄντων μὴ Θεῶν, —λεγομένων δὲ· ἃ δὲ ἂν προσέκειτο, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, εἰ

And *Greg. Nazianz.* I conceive the Words, *that they may know Thee the onely true God*, are ſpoken to exclude thoſe who are no Gods, tho' they are ſo called; for it would not have been added, *and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*, if

if the Terms *the only true* had been uſed in oppoſition to the Son, and the whole Expreſſion had not been meant of the Divine Nature in common to them both.

πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀντιδιῃρῆσθαι τὸ μόνον ἀληθινὸν, ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ κοινῷ τῇ Θεότητι. ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Orat. 2. de Fil. p. 586. Edit. *Pariſ.*

This Obſervation upon the excluſive Term *Only*, is juſtified out of *Deut.* xxxii. 12. where it is uſed in oppoſition to falſe Gods, and not otherwiſe. *The Lord alone did lead Him, and there was no ſtrange God with Him.*

The Citations out of *Athanaſius* are to be explain'd by the Paſſages in *Numb.* 2. 3. adding only one Obſervation, that the Context ſhews, that in the laſt of thoſe Citations, *the only true God* is affirmed of the Father in oppoſition to falſe Gods.

Origen indeed makes the *only true God* to ſignify the Father as he is ἀυτόθεος, *God underived from any Cauſe*; but perhaps it may be as difficult to prove this Senſe of the Words out of Scripture, which the Dr. profeſſes to be his Rule in theſe Matters, as it is to make

make good the critical Remark of the ſame Father, that the Article ὁ prefixed to Θεὸς appropriates the Name to God the Father; when it is evident, that the *Son* is called *God* with the ſame Article, by his Diſciple *Thomas*, Joh. xxii. 28. ὁ Θεός μου· And by St. *Paul* alſo in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, c. i. *v.* 8. which is taken from *Pſal.* xlv. 6. to ſay nothing of Writers older than *Origen*; and even of *Origen* himſelf, who deſtroys his Criticiſm in his own Writings, as will appear from one Inſtance that may ſerve for others, μεταμορφώσει ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, which He uſes of the Son, *Lib.* 4. *cont. Celſ. p.* 170.

VIII. 1 Cor. viii. 4. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but* One.

Here it is plain, that the Unity of the God is affirmed in oppoſition to Idols.

Ver. 5, 6. *For though there be that are called Gods,—— as there be Gods many, and Lords many.—— To us there is but* one *God the Father,*

Here again the Unity of the Godhead is oppoſed to the Multitude of pretended Deities; and tho' the Fathe:

ther be ſaid to be the *one* God; yet is not this ſpoken to the Excluſion of the Son, who has been proved to be comprehended in the *one God*. N° 2, 3.

Irenæus expreſſes himſelf after this manner,

And thus it is proved, that there is *one God the Father*, who is above all, and thro' all, and in all; above all (as) *Father*,—— thro' all (as) *Word*—— and in all of us (as) *Spirit*.—For there is one Father, *who is above all, and thro' all, and in us all*, Epheſ. iv. 6.

Et ſic unus Deus Pater oſtenditur, qui eſt ſuper omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater—— per omnia autem Verbum—— in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus—— quia unus Pater, qui eſt ſuper omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus Nobis. Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 5. c. 18.

In theſe Words it is plain, that under *one God the Father*, is contained the *Word*, who *is thro' all*; and the *Spirit*, which *is in all*; in which reſpect He is ſaid to be *thro' all*, and *in all*.

Ver. 6. *And in one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

This

This is not added as if the Son were not comprehended in *the one God the Father*, as He is the *Word*; but forasmuch as the Son is not only God, but God and Man conſiſting of two Natures; and by reaſon of that Union cannot be comprehended, as to his whole Perſon, under any one of them; therefore does He ſeem to be mentioned after *God the Father*, as a Being diſtinct from pure Deity, ſuch as the Father is; tho' his ſuperiour Nature, or God the Word, is comprehended in it. See N° 501.

The Paſſage out of Mr. *Mede*, which ſays, that we have but *One in each ſort of ſuperior and inferior Deities*, ſuppoſes indeed, that the Father is the ſuperior, and the Son the inferior Deity. But ſince He oppoſes the Son to the *Baalim*, or *Dæmon* Mediators of the Heathen, who were the inferior Deities, and nothing more than the Souls of Men deified after Death, as he affirms, *Lib.* 3. *c.* 4. it appears to be plain, that when he names Chriſt the inferior Deity, he means it in no other reſpect, than in that of his deify'd Soul or deify'd Humanity. And therefore

fore tells us, *Chap.* 6. That when the *Athenian* Philoſophers had heard *Paul* preach *Jeſus riſen from the Dead*, they encountred him on that account, as a Setter forth of ſtrange *Dæmon* Gods, δαιμονίων, *Acts* xvii. 18. and that *Celſus* in *Orig. Lib.* 8. calls Jeſus Chriſt the Chriſtian's *Dæmon*, becauſe he was honoured by them with Divine Worſhip after Death, as their Lord and Saviour.

LXVI. Acts v. 3, 4. *To* Lie *to the* Holy Ghoſt.—— *thou haſt not lied unto Men, but unto* God.

If the term *God* can be apply'd to the *Holy Ghoſt*, (ſee Nº 1056, 1075, 1132, 1211, 1248.) Why ſhould there be ſo much Pains taken to prove it to belong to the Father, who is not mentioned in the Context? But if the term *God* cannot be apply'd to the Holy Ghoſt, how comes it about that when the Object of the *Lie* is ſaid by the Apoſtle to be not himſelf, but God, the Author of his Power and Miſſion, it is yet affirmed to be the Holy Ghoſt? Since if the Holy Ghoſt be not *God*, but act by an Authority derived from

him, the Perſon of the Spirit would be as little affected with the *Lie* ſpoken in compariſon of the Authority affronted in him, as the Perſons of the Apoſtles were affected by it in compariſon of the Authority affronted in them. Or if the Perſon of the Spirit were the Object of the *Lie*, by reaſon of the Authority delegated to him, the Apoſtles themſelves would have been the Objects of it alſo, from the ſame Authority committed to them. Which is a Difficulty that is not removed by the large Citations alledged by the Dr., becauſe, tho' it be granted, that God is preſent in an eſpecial manner, whereſoever his Spirit is; and that He is affronted in thoſe, in whom his Spirit is, as being preſent with them through the ſame Spirit, when the Affront is offered; yet does it not follow, neither can it be granted, that what is a *Lye* againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould be comparatively *none* againſt the Sons of Men, except it be true, That the Spirit is God.

As for the Explication of *Athanaſius*, it is certain, that in the very Section out of which it is taken, He teaches the Eſſential Unity of the Spirit with God, and

and therefore looked upon the Sin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, to be done againſt *God*, as being both ſubjectively *One*, tho' Perſonally two.

The Spirit of God (ſays He) is no ſtranger to, or is not ſeparated from, the Divinity and Eſſence of God.

Τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς Θεότητός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλότριον. De Incarn. & cont. Ar. §. 13. *See alſo* §. 9.

CLXXX. Galat. iv. 8. *Ye did ſervice unto them which by Nature are no Gods*; τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς.

The Comment on theſe Words is, *Unto Gods which have no Being in Nature*; or *to Gods, which in Nature* (or *in reality*) *have no Being.*

Firſt, then, this rendring is contrary to the two moſt antient Verſions: The Vulgar reads it according to our Tranſlation.

Which by Nature are no Gods. *Qui naturâ non ſunt Dii.*

Qui naturâ ſuâ non ſunt Dii. The *Syriac* is more plain. Which by their own Nature are no Gods.

Which is followed by the *Arabic*.

Secondly, The rendring in the Comment, is not agreeable to the Apoſtle's Style of Writing.

For *Firſt*, He no where uſes φύσις for Nature in general, or the Syſtem of Natural Beings, as the Dr. ſeems to do; for I conceive his Meaning is, That they are Gods, which have no Exiſtence among natural or real Beings.

Secondly, had φύσις, or Nature been uſed by him in that general Notion, yet would he have expreſſed himſelf by ἐν φύσει, and not φύσει alone, after the Participle of the Verb Subſtantive ὤν; if *in Nature*, and not *by Nature*, had been his true Meaning, as will appear from the following Inſtances;

Rom. viii. 8. οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες.
They that are in the Fleſh.
Chap. i. 7. τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ῥώμῃ.
That be in Rome.

neither

neither am I conſcious of any one Inſtance to the contrary, in all the Apoſtles Writings.

Thirdly, if φύσει be granted to ſignifie what the Comment would have it, yet is it not probable that the Apoſtle would have join'd it with τοῖς μὴ οὖσι, to ſignifie *Things, which have no real Being*; becauſe this latter Expreſſion would have done it of itſelf according to his Style in the like Caſes; as *Rom.* iv. 17. 1 *Cor.* i. 28. τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ſignifies *things which are not*, or, have no Exiſtence; which is agreeable to the *Septuagint*, *Iſai.* xli. 11, 12. where ἔσονται ὡς οὐκ ὄντες, has this Meaning, *They ſhall be as if they were not*, or had not been; or, as thoſe who have no Exiſtence at all. So in like manner may it be ſuppoſed, that the Apoſtle would have uſed τοῖς Θεοῖς τοῖς μὴ οὖσι, to have expreſſed *Gods who have no Exiſtence at all*, or, no real Exiſtence, had that been his Mind.

But *Fourthly*, φύσει is uſed in this very Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, and in all other Writings of this Apoſtle for, *by Nature*, and not for, *in Nature*; as the few Particulars will evince.

Ημεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι. Galat. ii. 15. *We who are Jews* by Nature.

Φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῇ. Rom. ii. 14. *Do* by Nature *the Things contained in the Law.*

Καὶ ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς. Eph. ii. 3. *And were* by Nature *the Children of Wrath.*

Gregory Nyſſen argues thus upon the Text;

Εἰ μὴ ἔν ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς χωρὶς τοῦ εἶναι φύσει Θεὸς, αὐτὸς ἂν εἰδείη ταῦτα λέγων· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι Θεὸς ὁ μὴ φύσει Θεὸς ὤν, μαθέτωσαν ἐκ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου, ὅτι οἱ δουλεύοντες τοῖς μὴ φύσει Θεοῖς, Θεῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν. contr. Eunom. *p.* 9. *Edit. Par.*

If therefore the Son be God without being *God by Nature*, let him look to to that, who affirms it. But if He is no God, who is not God by Nature, let them learn from the great Apoſtle, that they, who ſerve thoſe who are not Gods by Nature, do not ſerve God.

Heb.

CCLXIV. Heb. iii. 3, 4. *For this Perſon* (viz. Chriſt) *was counted worthy of more Glory than Moſes, inaſmuch as He who hath builded the Houſe, hath more honour than the Houſe. For every Houſe is builded by ſome one; But He that built all Things is God.*

In theſe Words, *v.* 3. Chriſt is the Builder of the Houſe; and the Church is the Houſe, *v.* 6. *whoſe Houſe are we:* And *Moſes*, having been a chief Servant in it, was a Part of the Houſe, and was as much exceeded by Chriſt in Glory, as the Houſe is by the Builder. And to prove that Chriſt was the Builder, he ſhews, Firſt, That the Houſe was not Self-exiſtent, but had a Cauſe, *for every Houſe is builded by ſome One.* Secondly, That *God was the Builder*, becauſe *he built all things*, of which the Houſe is a Part. Now if this *God* is not *Chriſt*, but a diſtinct Being from him; how does the aſſerting one Being to be a Builder prove another to be ſo? except it be upon the following Suppoſition, that the One never acts without the Other, or the Father without the Son; which tho' it be indeed

true, and ſo the Creation of the Father infers that of the Son; yet ſince that Reaſon is not aſſigned in this place for the Inference, and the Inference may appear too remote, or not ſufficiently clear, if it be drawn from the Premiſe, by means of a Suppoſition concealed in the Mind, and not expreſſed; it is natural to conclude that *Chriſt* is meant by the Term *God*; eſpecially if we look back upon the beginning of this Epiſtle, where the Creation of the World, or *of all Things*, is attributed to the Son, Ch. i. 10. and conſider, that *the building of the Houſe* is given to *Wiſdom*, or the Divine † Word and Son of God, Prov. ix. 1. *Wiſdom hath builded her Houſe.*

† Prov. viii. 22.

CCLXXXIX. 2 *Pet.* i. 1. The Righteouſneſs *of our God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

If we determine the Senſe of theſe Words by the other like Expreſſions in Scripture, they will appear rather to belong to the Son than to the Father. The Words in the Original are thus, τῦ Θεῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ· The like to which are

Τῦ

Τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
Of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, v. 11. and Ch. iii. 18.

Now these latter are evidently understood of *one* Person, as appears from the Doxology immediately following, that is directed to *one*, and not more; *to Him be glory*, &c. *c.* iii. 18.

Of the like Construction are,

Τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, c. ii. 20.

Τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος.
Of the Lord and Saviour, c. iii. 2.

Which I think both belong to the Son alone; neither do I know any one Place of the same Construction and Terms that may seem to contradict this Remark, except it be the following,

Τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
The great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, Tit. iii. 13.

Which

Which yet is underſtood by *Clemens Alexandr.* (a) of *God the Son alone*, and by *Greg. Nyſſ.* alſo in his Book againſt *Eunom. p.* 265. and their Interpretation may be confirmed from the Word ἐπιφάνεια, uſed in the Context, which relates to the *appearing* of no other Perſon in the remaining part of the New Teſtament, but of the Son only.

(a) Protrept. p. 6. Edit. Par. 1629.

CCCXL. Mat xix. 17. *Why calleſt thou me Good? There is none* Good, *but* One (εἷς, one Being) *that is God.* Or, There is none *Good but God alone.* See N° 1.

That *Clemens Alexand.* included the Son in the *one good God*, is evident from the following Words, that are in the very next Page to the Paſſage cited by the learned Dr. under this Number.

Ὡς ἔστι) παῖς ἀληθείαις καταφανὲς τὸ, τὸν συμπάντων Θεὸν ἕνα μόνον ἔστι) ἀγαθὸν, δίκαιον δημιουργὸν, ὑὸν ἐν Πατρί. ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, Ἀμήν. *Pædag. Lib.* 1. *p.* 119.

So that it is truly evident, that *the God of all*, is the *one only good*, and juſt Creatour, namely, the Son in the Father; to whom be Glory for ever and ever. *Amen.* See alſo N° 535.

The

The Citation out of *Athanaſ.* has been already explain'd N° 2. and excludes not the Son from *the one good God.*

And when *Novatian* uſes theſe Words,

Whom alone the Lord juſtly pronounces to *be good*;

Quem ſolum merito bonum pronunciat Dominus.

He cannot be ſuppoſed to ſhut out the Son from the eſſential Goodneſs of the Father, becauſe he makes him to be of one Subſtance with the Father, *c.* xxiii. 31. As for *Self-originated*, and *begotten*, they do not appear to be eſſential, but perſonal Characters, inferring not a Difference of Subſtance, but a different manner of having their Subſiſtence; the Son receiving it by Generation from the Father, which denominates him *begotten*, the Father having it without receiving it from any other, which names him *Self-originated.* See N° 591.

CCCLXXII. Rom. xi. 36. Of *him, and* through *him, and* to *him are all things.*

Of

Of him, as he is *Father*; *through* him, as he is *Son*; *to* (or rather *in*, for ſo the Particle εἰς is frequently uſed) *him*, as he is the *Holy Ghoſt*.

Nam & imperio ejus omnia, ut ex ipſo ſint & Verbo ejus digeſta, ut per ipſum ſint. c. 3. de Trin.

All things exiſt by his Command, ſo that they are *of him*; and are order'd by his *Word*, ſo that they are *through him*, ſays *Novatian* upon the Place. See N° 8. and 382.

CCCLXXXII. Eph. iv. 6. *One God and Father of all, who is* above *all*, and through *all*, *and* in *you all*.

This is underſtood of the Trinity, by *Iren.* Lib. 5. c. 18. See N° 8. and 372.

CCCXCV. Tit. ii. 13. *The appearing of the Glory of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

See this Text explained, N° 289.

CCCCX. 1 John v. 20, 21. *This is the true God and Eternal Life.——Keep yourſelves from Idols.*

The Comment upon this Text is ſomething ſtrained and extraordinary. *This*

This (this Knowledge of God in his Son Jeſus Chriſt) is the true Religion, and the way to eternal Life. I wiſh ſome Inſtances had been given, in which *the true God* is uſed for *the true Religion:* But I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, That the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt is underſtood by theſe Words.

Firſt, from the general Deſign of the Epiſtle; which is not to teach the Truth and Exiſtence of the *One only God*, in oppoſition to Idols, but according to *c.* v. *v.* 13. to encourage the Believers to continue in the Faith of the Son of God, by aſſuring them that they had Eternal Life by virtue of that Faith, but not without it, *v.* 12. And therefore the Apoſtle begins his Epiſtle with the *Word of Life*, or Son, *c.* i. *v.* 1. and proceeds to ſpeak of Him, and of our Salvation by Him, throughout the whole Diſcourſe; and concludes it with the following Truth, as the Reſult of all he had been ſaying, namely, that the Son of God Jeſus Chriſt is himſelf *the true God*, and the only way to Eternal Life, or rather, *Eternal Life* it ſelf; and that therefore they ought to keep themſelves from Idols, or from all Means

of

of approaching God beſide this Divine Perſon, ending his Epiſtle, as he began his Goſpel, with the *Divinity of the Word.*

Secondly, From the Context, and that firſt, in reſpect of the term ἀληθινὸς, *True*, which is rarely apply'd to the Father, but frequently to the Son in St. *John*'s Writings. As for Inſtance, in an Emphatic Senſe, with the Article ὁ, it does not ſeem to have been *once* us'd of the Father, whereas it is ſpoken of the Son after this manner, not only in the Context, as ſhall be made to appear by and by; but in *Rev.* iii. 7. where it is written, *Theſe things ſaith He that is holy, He that is true*, ὁ ἀληθινὸς, that is, Chriſt, who is the Perſon ſpeaking to all the Churches. I cite not *Chap.* vi. 10. becauſe it does not ſo evidently appear to belong to Chriſt, tho' the greater Probability is on that Side, if it be compared with *Rev.* xix. 11. which certainly belongs to him.

Again, The ſame Term without an Article, is but *twice* uſed of the Father in the Writings of the ſame Apoſtle, and that in his Goſpel, *c.* vii. 28 and xvii. 8. whereas it is frequently affirm'd

of

of the Son, partly without an Article, and partly with one, as He is consider'd under certain metaphorical Characters, according to the following Citations, *John* i. 9. vi. 32. 1 *John* ii. 8. *Rev.* iii. 14. xix. 11. In the last of which it is said, that *He that sat upon him* (the white Horse) *was called Faithful and True*, as if *True* were a Name, or Attribute more particularly the Son's.

These general Remarks are a strong Prejudice in favour of the common Interpretation, that *the true God* is the Son *of God*; but the whole Verse will more particularly shew it, which runs thus, *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true*, (τὸν ἀληθινόν·) *and we are in him that is true* (ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ) *even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal Life.* In which it is plain, that the Terms *in him that is true* are explain'd by *in his Son*; so that no doubt can be made, but that the Word *True* belongs to Christ; the Difficulty is, whether the first Expression, *that we may know him that is True*, belongs to the Son also. And here I think

think it is certain, that the Application of the ſame Phraſe to Chriſt in the ſame Verſe, is a ſtrong Probability that this is ſpoken of Him alſo, ſince there is nothing in the Context, that appears to contradict it, and the Senſe of the Expreſſion will evidently allow it: For moſt certainly Jeſus Chriſt *came* into the World to bear Teſtimony to himſelf, that he was the *true* Meſſiah, and to *give Men an underſtanding* to receive his Teſtimony, as is evident from *John* xviii. 37, 38. *Pilate ſaid unto him, art thou a King?* (the King of the *Jews*, *v.* 33.) *Jeſus anſwered, Thou ſayeſt that I am a King*, (the King of the *Jews.*) *To this end was I born, and for this cauſe came I into the World, that I ſhould bear witneſs to the Truth*, (to his being the the King of the *Jews.*) *Every one that is of the Truth, heareth my Voice*, (hath *an underſtanding* to receive his Teſtimony, or know him to be the King of the *Jews*, or the *true* Meſſiah.) It is probable then from this Evidence, that *the Underſtanding*, which *the Son of God gave* Men *to know him that is true*, was to know himſelf as the *true* Meſſiah, and King of the *Jews*, and expected

pected Saviour; and under this Character of the *true* Meſſiah, King, and Saviour, who *bears witneſs to the Truth* of his own Perſon, is He well oppos'd to the ὁ Πονηρὸς, the Wicked One, the Devil, *v.* 19, 20. *Who is a Lyar, and the Father of a Lye*, John viii. 44. Who will pretend himſelf to be that which he is not, and whoſe greateſt and moſt notorious *Lye* will conſiſt in denying the Truth, that was atteſted to by Chriſt, namely, That Jeſus Chriſt is the *true* Meſſiah, the King of the *Jews*; or that Jeſus Chriſt came in the (*a*) Fleſh, or as *Origen* expreſſes it, (*a*) 1 Joh. ii. 21, 22. & iv. 3.

That *God* came in a human Soul and Body. Θεὸν ἐληλυθότα ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι. cont. Celſ. Lib. 3. p. 128.

And in ſubſtituting another in the place of Chriſt, 2 *Theſ.* ii. If then the Term *true* be rarely uſed of the Father in the Writings of St. *John*, but frequently of the Son; if never of the Father in the firſt Epiſtle; if it belongs to the Son in the Context, as He is the *true* Meſſiah, King and Saviour; and as He is the Amen, *the faithful and true Witneſs*, (*b*) (*b*) Revel. iii. 14.

in oppoſition to the *Wicked one*, *the Lyar*, and falſe Witneſs; and if the Term *this*, in Grammatical Conſtruction, generally refers to the laſt Noun, what, but apparent Prejudice, can determine any one to underſtand the Expreſſion, *This is the True God*, of any other but the Son? Eſpecially ſince it was given to the Son in the earlieſt Times, as appears from *Irenæus*, who ſays,

Neque Prophetæ, neque Apoſtoli, alium Deum nominaverunt—præter verum & ſolum Deum, Lib. 3. c. 8.

That neither the Prophets nor Apoſtles have named any other, *God*,—— beſides the *True and Only God*.

But then he grants the *Son* to be called *God* in an abſolute Senſe, c. vi. and ſays,

Ab omnibus accipiens teſtimonium —— quoniam verè Deus, à Patre, à Spiritu, & ab Angelis, &c. Lib. 4. c. 14.

That He receives Teſtimony from all Things—— that He is *truely God*, from the Father, from the Holy Ghoſt, and from Angels, *&c.*

There-

Therefore did he look upon the Son to be *true God*.

Melito gives Him the ſame Title of *true God*, Θεὸς ἀληθὴς, in his Fragment, in *Cave*'s Hiſt. Lit.

The Church of *Jeruſalem* confeſſed Him to be ſuch in their Creed, calling Him Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν.

And the Univerſal Church, or Generality of Chriſtians, had the ſame Faith, and publickly declar'd it in a general Council about the beginning of the fourth Century, as appears from the *Nicene* Creed, which ſtyles him alſo, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν. See N° 534.

Secondly, The following Part of the Context, *Eternal Life*, is another Argument that the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt is underſtood by the *true God:* For it does not appear that thoſe Terms are ſpoken of any other Perſon in the whole Epiſtle, but of the Son only; as *c.* i. 2. v. 11, 12, 13. if then the Son be the *eternal Life*; the *true God*, who is this *eternal Life*, muſt be the Son alſo.

CCCCXI. Jude *v.* the 4th. *Denying the* † only Lord God, *and our Lord Jesus Christ.*

† See N° 2, 3.

We must not understand the Citation out of *Pearson*, as if that learned Author meant that the Son, as well as other Beings, received his Power from the Father, either by Donation or Permission; for he says, *p.* 17[illegible] *Edit.* 7. That God was *always Father*, as *always God*; which seems to import, that the Character of Father depends upon the Godhead, and not upon the Will; that he is as necessarily *Father* as *God*; and consequently that the Son is as necessarily Son, as the Father is Father; and that therefore his Power founded upon his Nature, is no more by bare *Donation* from the Father, than his very Being.

CCCCXLIV. Matt. vi. 9. *Our* †*Father, which art in Heaven*, &c.

† *Tertullian* in his Comment on the Lord's Prayer, written before he was a *Montanist*,

Montaniſt, comprehends the *Son* under the Name *Father*, ſaying,

The *Son* alſo is invoked in the Father. *Item in Patre Filius invocatur* c. 2.

And he ſays of Chriſt, who taught the Prayer,

God only could teach how He would have *Himſelf* be pray'd to. *Deus ſolus docere potuit, ut ſe vellet orari.* c. 9.

DI. 1 Tim. ii. 5, *For there is* * One God, *and* † one Mediator *between God and Men.*

* In oppoſition to falſe Gods. See N° 2, 3, 8.

† The mentioning the Son here after the *One God*, is not an Argument that He is excluded out of the *One God*, but that He is ſomething more than pure Deity, a Mediator made up of God and Man; and therefore was to be ſpoken of diſtinctly by Himſelf. See N° 8.

That the Notion of *very God* and *very Man* was comprehended in the meaning of the Word *Mediator*; or, that the Perſon ſo named was believed to be *true*

God and *true Man*, will appear from the following Authorities.

Ἥνωσεν οὖν τὸ ἄνθρωπον τῷ Θεῷ· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἄνθρωπος ἐνίκησεν τὸν ἀντικείμενον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ ἂν δικαίως ἐνικήθη ὁ ἐχθρὸς· πάλιν εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδωρήσατο τὴν σωτηρίαν, οὐκ ἂν βεβαίως ἔχομεν αὐτήν· καὶ εἰ μὴ συνηνώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ Θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας· ἔδει γὰρ τὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν πρὸς ἑκατέρους οἰκειότητα εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν· καὶ Θεῷ μὲν παραστῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸν Θεόν. Lib. 3. c. 20.

Irenæus says, He (Christ) united *Man* to *God*; for except *Man* had overcome the Adversary of Man, the Enemy could not have been conquer'd fairly. And again, except *God* had given Salvation, we could not have enjoyed it securely; and except *Man* had been united to *God*, He could not have been Partaker of Incorruption: For it became the Mediator of *God* and *Men*, by his proper Relation to each (of the Parties,) to bring them to an Agreement, and make them both Friends; and to present or unite *Man* to *God*, and make *God* known to *Men*.

In which Words it is plain, that the great Design of the Son's Incarnation was according to this Authour, to unite *Man* imme-

immediately to *the true God*; and that this was to be performed in his own Person, by uniting his own Divine Nature, or Himself, as † *God*, to the human Nature, as *Irenæus* explains himself a little after: For if his own Divine Nature was not *true God*, and no human Nature can arise to a sublimer Union with God than that of the Son; it will follow, that no human Nature can be immediately united to *the true God*; which is contrary to the Intent of the Father's Reasoning, which is to shew the immediate Union of *Man* with *the true God*, by the immediate Union of *Man* with *God* in the Person of Christ.

† The *Word* was that, which it appeared to be; namely, *God* restoring in himself the old created Nature of Man.

Quod autem parebat, hoc erat; Deus hominis antiquam plasmationem in se recapitulans. Ibid.

Tertullian says, He is called the Mediator of *God* and *Men* from that which is committed to him by both Parties, (or, from the Nature of both Parties communicated to him.)

Hic Sequester Dei atq; Hominum appellatus ex utriusq; partis depositio commisso sibi. De Resur. Car. c. 51. *Edit. De La Cerda.*

Hippolytus has theſe Words,

Ut demonſtretur utramq; quidem in ſe habere ſubſtantiam, ſcil. Dei & Hominum, ſicut Apoſtolus ait: Mediator quidem Dei & Hominum, Homo Chriſtus Jeſus— oportebat ergo ut Chriſtus factus Mediator Dei & hominum, ab utriſq; arrabonem quandam acciperet, ut appareat Mediator duarum naturarum. Vid. Leont. advoc. cont. Neſt. & Eut. Lib. 1. p. 463. Tom. 6. Bibl. Patr. ed. Col. Agrip.

So that it may be demonſtrated, that he has both Subſtances in himſelf, namely, that of *God*, and that *of Men*; as the Apoſtle ſays, *the Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.*——— It was fitting therefore that Chriſt, who became the Mediator between *God* and *Men*, ſhould receive an Earneſt or Pledge from both (Parties,) that he might appear to be the Mediator between the two Natures.

Cyprian ſays thus,

Deus cum homine miſcetur. Hic Deus noſter, hic Chriſtus eſt. Qui Mediator

God is united to Man. This is our *God*, this is Chriſt. Who being the Mediator between two, aſ-

ſumed

ſumed Man, that he might bring him to the Father.

duorum, hominem induit, quem perducat ad Patrem. De Idol. vanit. p. 15. Edit. *Oxon.*

Novatian ſays, For if he came to Man, that he might be the Mediator between God and Men, it was neceſſary that he ſhould be with Man, and that the Word ſhould become Fleſh, that he might unite in Himſelf both the things in Earth, and the things in Heaven, in perfect Concord; while he joined *God* to *Man*, and *Man* to *God*, by the Union of the Pledges (or Natures) of both Parties in his own Perſon.

Quoniam ſi ad hominem veniebat, ut Mediator Dei & hominum eſſe deberet, oportuit illum cum eo eſſe, & Verbum carnem fieri, ut in ſemetipſo concordiam conſibularet terrenorum pariter atque cœleſtium, dum utriuſque partis in ſe connectens † pignora, & Deum homini, & hominem Deo copularet. de Trin. c. 18.

† *Note*, That which he calls here *utriuſq; partis pignora*, is in *Irenæus*, τὰ ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρας οἰκειότητος; in *Tertullian*, *utriuſq; partis depoſito*; and in *Hippolytus*, *ab utriſq; Arrabonem*;

nem; which is explained by, *utramq; Substantiam, scil. Dei & Hominum.*

DXXXII. Revel. xxii. 9. *Worship* God.

Cyprian reads or explains it thus.

Jesum Dominum Worship the Lord Je-
adora. De bono sus.
pat. p. 152. Edit.
Amstel.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the SON *of* GOD.

DXXXIV. LUKE i. 16, 17. *Many —shall He* (John the Baptiſt) *turn to* the Lord their God; *and He ſhall go before* Him, *&c.*

The Dr's Remark is very good, that the Words "(the Lord their God) are "in ſtrictneſs of Conſtruction immedi-"ately connected with the following "Word, *Him*"; which muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of Chriſt, did He not endeavour to ſpoil the Conſequence of it, by his References to N° 538, and 293.

The great Difficulty, which that learned Gentleman makes of underſtanding the Words of Chriſt, is a Suppoſition, that

that according to the whole Analogy of Scripture (I ſuppoſe He means the Old Teſtament as well as the New) they cannot but ſignifie the Father; which if I ſhew to be a Miſtake, then the ſtrictneſs of Conſtruction ought to take place, and determine them for the Son.

I will begin firſt with the New Teſtament; in which *Thomas* calls the Son, *my Lord and my God*, Joh. xx. 28. and if He was the *Lord God* of *Thomas*, He was, without doubt, as much the *Lord God* of every believing *Iſraelite*; in *Rev.* xxii. 6. He is called *the Lord God of the Holy Prophets*, as will appear from the Context, *the Lord God of the Holy Prophets ſent his Angel to ſhew unto his Servants the Things, which muſt ſhortly be done:* Now the Perſon who ſent the Angel for this purpoſe, is Jeſus Chriſt, *v.* 16. *I Jeſus have ſent mine Angel to teſtifie unto you theſe Things in the Churches*; Which is confirmed *c.* i. *v.* 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him, to ſhew* (that He, Jeſus, might ſhew) *unto his Servants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs; and He* (Jeſus) *ſent and ſignified it by his Angel unto his Servant John.* If then God the Father did not

ymmediately

immediately ſend the Angel himſelf, but revealed the Secret to Jeſus Chriſt, that He (as *Mediator*) might have the Honour of ſending it by *his* Angel to his Servant *John*; it will follow, that the *Lord God of the Holy Prophets*, who *ſent his Angel*, is Jeſus Chriſt, and if He be *the Lord God* of the Prophets, He is queſtionleſs of the Church alſo.

But if He had not been ſo called in the New Teſtament, which treats of the Son in reſpect of his Humiliation or Incarnation chiefly, and of the Benefits reſulting from it; yet ſecondly if he be ſo called in the Old Teſtament, as interpreted by the New, this is ſufficient to ſhew, that *Lord God* is not appropriated to the Father, according to the whole Analogy of Scripture. As for Inſtance, *Iſai.* xl. 3. is cited *Luke* iii. 4. thus, *The Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his Paths ſtraight.* But in *Iſai.* it is thus, *Make ſtraight in the Deſert a Highway for our God.* In which Application of the Text by St. *Luke* it is evident, that by *the Voice* is underſtood *John* the Baptiſt; and by the Perſon, whoſe Way he was ſent to prepare,

† Luke i. 15,17,76. Acts xiii. 24.

prepare, Jesus † Christ; but this Person is called *Lord* (Jehovah,) and *God* (Elohijm) or, *our God*, that is, the God of the *Jews*. Therefore Jesus Christ is *the Lord God*, or, Jehovah Elohijm, the God of the *Jews*, no less than of the believing *Gentiles*; and may well be *the Lord God*, to whom many were to be converted. But to proceed; In *Isai.* xl. *v.* 9. it is said of him, *Say unto the Cities of Judah, Behold your God:* And *v.* 10. *Behold, the Lord God will come with strong Hand, and his Arm shall rule for him.* Ver. 11. *He shall feed his Flock like a Shepherd:* For the Son is the *good Shepherd*, John x. 11. and *the chief Shepherd*, 1 Pet. v. 4. The same Person in the process of the Chapter, for there are no Tokens of a change of Person, is called also the *everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the Earth*, and the Workmanship of the *Heavens* is attributed to him,

Again, when the Apostle saith, *Let the Angels of God worship Him* (the Son,) *Heb.* i. 6. the Context out of which it is taken, *Deut.* xxxii. 43. both in the *Sept.* and *Hebrew*, shew the Person spoken of to be *the Lord God.*

I will

I will add but one Inſtance more out of the ſame Epiſtle and Chapter, *v.* 10, *&c.* in which, part of the 102 *Pſalm* is applied to Chriſt; now in the Epiſtle he is only called *Lord*, but in the *Pſalm*, *v.* 24. immediately preceding the Citation, he is called *God*. *O my God, take me not away*, &c.

I will proceed from Scripture to Authority, and here we ſhall find the moſt celebrated of the Antients calling Chriſt in his own Perſon, *Lord God.*

Juſtin ſays, That Chriſt who is *Lord and God*, &c.

Ὅτι Κύριος ὢν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 820. *Edit. Steph.*

And God the Father is the cauſe of his (the Son's) being——both *Lord and God.*

Αἴτιός τε αὐτοῦ τοῦ εἶναι——καὶ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. Ibid. p. 121.

Irenæus ſays, No——other——is named *God*, or called *Lord*, but He who is the *God and Lord* of all——and *his Son* Jeſus Chriſt our *Lord.*

Nemo — alius — Deus nominatur, aut Dominus appellatur, niſi qui eſt omnium Deus & Dominus—— Et hujus Filius Jeſus Chriſtus Dominus noſter. Lib. 3. c. 6. *Clem.*

Διὰ τοῦτό τοι εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν ἐπιγνώσονται Κύριον, καὶ δίκαιον. Pædag. Lib. 2. p. 182. Edit. *Pariſ.*

Clem. Alex. Therefore Him, on whom they did not believe as Man, they will acknowledge to be the merciful and juſt *Lord God.*

Scimus Dei nomen & Domini, & Patri, & Filio, & Spiritui Sancto convenire. Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 13.

Tertullian. We know that the Name of *God and Lord*, belongs to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

Ex his —— rebus ſuperioribus divinitatem Chriſti ſonantibus, Dominus Chriſtus Jeſus & Deus, quod Hæretici nolunt eſſe, monſtratur, c. 17.

Novatian. From what has been already alledged, to prove the Divinity of Chriſt, it is demonſtrated, that Jeſus Chriſt is *Lord and God*, which *the Hereticks deny.*

The Synod of *Antioch* ſays,

Ὁ δὲ Ἄγγελος τοῦ Παλαιὸς ὁ υἱός ἐστι, αὐτὸς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ὤν. Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. ad Paul. Samoſ.

The Meſſenger of the Father is the Son, who himſelf is *Lord and God.*

And

And to conclude all, tho' more might have been cited on this occaſion, *Euſebius* calls the Son,

The *Lord and God* of all created Things.

Τὸν τῶν γενητῶν ἁπάντων κύριον καὶ Θεόν. Eccleſ. Hiſt. c. 2.

And abſolutely Lord God;

The Lord God is ſaid to have appeared ——to *Abraham.*

Ὤφθαι γὰρ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀνείρηται —— τῷ Ἀβραάμ. Ibid.

If the many Citations of theſe Authors out of Scripture ſhould be produced, in which the Perſon, ſpoken of as *Lord God*, is Interpreted by them to be the Son of God, it would tire the Reader as well as the Writer: What has been already urged does ſufficiently ſhew their Opinion of the Son: And if we would know more, their large Writings will teach us the Scriptures, on which it was founded, and their Interpretation of the Scriptures will teach and inſtruct us what Doctrines and Expoſitions of the Sacred Writings, were handed down to them by Tradition from their Fathers.

Of the Importance of the Title *Lord God*, *Irenæus* ſhall be Witneſs, who affirms,

Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus, neque Apoſtoli eum, qui non eſſet Deus, definitivè & abſolutè Deum nominâſſent aliquando, niſi eſſet verè Deus, neque Dominum appellâſſent aliquem ex ſuâ perſonâ, niſi qui dominatur omnium Deum Patrem, & Filium ejus, qui dominium accepit à Patre *ſuo omnis conditionis.* Lib. 3. c. 6.

That neither the Lord himſelf, nor the Holy Ghoſt, nor the Apoſtles, would at any time have called him, who was not God, expreſly and abſolutely *God*, if He had not been truly *God*; nor have named any one *Lord* in his own Perſon, but He who rules over all, namely, God the Father; and his Son, who has received from Him the Dominion over all Creatures.

And then affirms Father and Son to be called *God and Lord* by the Holy Ghoſt, which is an Evidence, that He looked upon the Son to be *true God and Lord*, like the Father.

And

And leſt any notwithſtanding, ſhould conceive the Son to be ſuch a God to the inferior Creation, as *Moſes* was to *Pharoah*, He diſtinguiſhes, ſaying,

Moſes indeed — was ſaid to be a *God* to *Pharaoh*, Exod. vii. 1. But He was not called *truly Lord*, nor *God* by the Prophets, but *Moſes* the Faithful Miniſter and Servant of God, by the Spirit, *Numb.* xii. 7. *Heb.* iii. 5. as indeed He was.

Et ipſe autem Moſes — Deus quidem dictus eſt ante Pharaonem; non autem verè Dominus appellatur, nec Deus vocatur à Prophetis, ſed fidelis Moyſes famulus & ſervus Dei dicitur à Spiritu, quod & erat. Ibid.

If then the Writings of the Old and New Teſtament; if the Doctrine of the Antient Fathers, founded upon Scripture, and their Scripture Interpretations juſtly conceived to be founded upon Tradition, and the Analogy of Faith have evinced and delivered to us, that Chriſt is *Lord God*; and if the ſtrictneſs of Conſtruction, as the Dr. confeſſes, connects theſe Terms with the Son of God, *Luke* i. 16, 17. then is Jeſus Chriſt *the Lord God* of the *Jews*, to

whom many were to be turned, by the Preaching of the Baptiſt; and thus is the Text explained by *Irenæus*;

Cui ergo populum præparavit, & in cujus Domini conſpectu magnus factus eſt? Utique ejus qui dixit; quoniam & plus quam Propheta habuit aliquid Johannes—— Et propter hoc convertens eos ad Dominum eorum, præparabat Domino populum perfectum. Lib. 3. c. 11.

For whom did He (the Baptiſt) prepare a People? And in the Sight of what *Lord* was He made great? Truly in the Sight of Him (Chriſt) who ſaid, that *John* was more than a Prophet.—— And therefore *turning them to their Lord*, (*Chriſt*) He prepared for the Lord (Chriſt) a perfect People, *&c.*

DXXXV. John i. 1. *And the Word was* † *God.*

The third Interpretation of the Word *God* in the Comment, and which is delivered as the true one is the following, " A Perſon deriving from the " Father (with whom he exiſted be- " fore the World was) both his Being " it ſelf, and incomprehenſible Power " and Knowledge, and other Divine " Attri-

" Attributes and Authority." If now by *the Being derived from the Father* be meant that which is conſubſtantial with the Father; and by *incomprehenſible and divine Attributes*, ſuch as are eſſentially inherent in the conſubſtantial Being, the Explication is Good. But if any thing leſs be meant by them, ſuch as that the *derived Being* is ſubſtantially different from the Father, and *the incomprehenſible and divine Attributes* not eſſentially inherent, but adventitious to the Subject, or *derived Being*; it will be hard to make out how a Perſon ſo conceived can be properly comprehended under the Name *God*. It is added, " In a manner not revealed." But *the manner is revealed* ſo far as it is expreſſed and conveyed to the Underſtanding by the general Term *Generation*, tho' the particular manner of Generation is not diſcovered; for the Prophet *Iſaiah* doth not ſay in general, who ſhall declare the manner of his deriving his Being? That is, whether it be by Generation, Proceſſion, Manifeſtation, or otherwiſe: But *who ſhall declare his Generation?* Allowing the manner to be by *Generation*, but

denying the manner of Generation to be known.

Et in quo distabit Dei Verbum, imò magis ipse Deus cum sit Verbum, à verbo hominum? &c. Lib. 2. c. 18.

† *Irenæus* says, Wherein will the Word of God, nay, rather *God himself, since he is the Word*, differ from the Word of Men? *&c.*

Οὐδὲν ἄρα μισεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου· ἓν γὰρ ἄμφω, ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι εἶπεν, ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Pædag. Lib. 1. c. 8. p. 113.

Clem. Alexandrinus says, Nothing therefore is hated of God or his Word, for they are both *One*, namely *God*. For he hath said, *In the beginning was the Word in God, and the Word was God.* See N° 594, 340.

DXXXVIII. Acts xx. 28. *To feed the Church of* God, *which* He *hath purchased* with his own Blood.

In the Note on this Place there is a Citation of 1 *John* iii. 5. *Ye know that He was manifested to take away our Sins; and in Him is no Sin.* On which Words is this Remark, " *He* and *Him* " must of necessity be referred to *Christ*, " though

" though without any antecedent men-
" tion of Him." It is readily granted that *He* and *Him* refer to Chriſt, but not that there is no antecedent mention made of Him. For if we look back upon the Context, and well conſider it, the Son will appear to be comprehended under the Name *God*. But before this be done, it will be neceſſary to remark, that St. *John* comprehends the Father and Son, under the Name *God*, as will appear from *John* i. 1. *The Word was with God*, and the *Word was God*: And therefore may be ſuppoſed to uſe the ſame Name ſometimes for the Father, and ſometimes for the Son, or for both together; which is always to be determined by the Circumſtances of the Context. Now this ſeems to be the very Caſe in this Chapter, *v.* 1. it is ſaid, *Behold, what manner of Love the Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the Sons of God.* In this place the term *God* may very well be judged to ſtand for the Father and Son, or for the *one God*, as comprehending the Father and Son; for the *waſhing of Regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5. through the Virtue of their Names invoked in Baptiſm, begets us into Chil-

dren; ſo that we are the Sons of both Perſons, as we become Children by a like Invocation of the Names of both.

Ver. 2. He ſays, *Beloved, now are we the Sons of God*, (of the one God, Father and Son) *and it doth not yet appear what we ſhall be: But we know, that when he ſhall appear*, ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῇ, when the one God ſhall appear in the Perſon of Son; for ſo the Word *appear*, or manifeſted, ἐφανερώθη, is ſpoken of the Son in *v.* 5, 8. and in other places of this Epiſtle; neither does it evidently appear to be once uſed of the Perſon of the Father in the Writings of St. *John*; nor perhaps in the whole New Teſtament; *We ſhall be like him; for we ſhall ſee him, as he is.* This may be very well explained by *Coloſ.* iii. 4. *When Chriſt, who is our Life, ſhall appear*, φανερωθῇ, *then ſhall ye alſo appear with him in Glory.*

Ver. 3. *And every Man that hath this Hope in him, purifieth himſelf, even as He* (God the Son) *is pure.* For ſo is it ſaid of Him, *v.* 7. *Even as He* (God the Son) *is righteous:* Which is the ſame with, *And in Him is no Sin*, v. 5. which is undoubtedly ſpoken of the Son; for the former part of the Verſe

Verſe runs thus, *And ye know that He* (God the Son ſpoken of *v.* 2, 3.) *was manifeſted*, ἐφανερώθη, *to take away our Sins*; for none other but the Son was manifeſted to do it. If then *God* be the common Name of the Father and the Son, and if it be ſo uſed of the Father and the Son in the firſt and ſecond Verſes of this Chapter, as the Style of ſpeaking there, and in the Context ſhews; how can it be ſaid that the Pronouns *He* and *Him* refer to Chriſt, without any antecedent mention of Him? There is indeed no antecedent mention of Him in this Chapter under the Name *Chriſt*, but He is plainly ſpoken of under the Name *God*.

DXLVI. John i. 3. *All things were made by* † *Him.*

† Not as by a Perſon ſubſtantially diſtinct from the divine Power dwelling in him, and uſing him as an Inſtrument; but as by the Son of a Father, who is himſelf like his Father eſſentially God, eſſentially Free, All-wiſe, All-powerful, and All-good; who though he works every thing in Obedience to his Father; yet works

* freely,

* freely, being moved thereto by an Excellency of Nature, that is the ſame in both; and that equally moves them, the Father primarily, and the Son ſubordinately, to the ſame Acts of Power and Goodneſs.

* *As the Father raiſeth up the Dead, and quickneth them: even ſo the Son quickneth whom He will*, John v. 21.

DLXXX. John v. 18. *But ſaid alſo* that God was his Father *(his own proper Father) making himſelf* † equal with God.

The Premiſe from whence the *Jews* made this Inference, that Chriſt called God his *proper Father*, and in ſo doing made himſelf *equal with God*, is his ſaying in the preceding Verſe, *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; which, if it meant no more, than that the Power of God wrought in Chriſt, as in a great Prophet, could have given as little occaſion for ſuch an Inference to be made by the *Jews*, in Relation to Chriſt, as it would have done in reſpect of *Moſes* or of any other Prophet, that wrought Wonders by a divine Power. The *Jews* therefore,

therefore, who drew the Inference, muſt have looked upon the Premiſe, as ſpoken in a Senſe, which attributed more to the Perſon ſpeaking than ever any Prophet or Man could claim; and which could bear the Concluſion, they readily drew from it and charged him with, *of making himſelf equal with God* the Father: They muſt have had ſome Reaſon alſo for underſtanding the Premiſe in ſo exalted a Senſe, as would infer their Concluſion; that is, they muſt have had a Notion that there was a certain Perſon ſo cloſely united to the *great God* in all his Operations, as that He never acted without that Perſon, nor that Perſon ever without God; and that the Perſon, ſo co-operating with the *great God*, was his proper Son, and the *great God* his proper Father, and that on this account He was *equal* with the Father; and that Jeſus Chriſt uſing the Expreſſion, *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; that properly belonged to the divine Perſon working with the Father, made himſelf the Son equal with the Father: For except all this be ſuppoſed to have been known to them, it is difficult to account, how ſo extraordinary a Concluſion could be drawn from a Premiſe, that

that was otherwiſe capable of a lower Interpretation: Now it is certain, that the *Jews*, if they underſtood the meaning of their own Scriptures, muſt have known, that there was a divine Perſon ſubſiſting with the Father, and operating with Him from the Beginning of the World, which is called *Wiſdom*, as is evident from *Prov.* ix. 22, 27, 30. *The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old.*—— *When He prepared the Heavens I was there*——— *then I was by Him as one brought up with him*, &c. *The Lord by Wiſdom hath founded the Earth.* Prov. iii. 19. *and made the Heavens:* Pſ. cxxxvi. 5. and That this Divine Perſon was *brought forth*, or *begotten*; *when there were no depths, I was brought forth.* —— *Before the Hills was I brought forth*, γεννᾶ με, *Sept.* Prov. viii. 24, 25. and by conſequence that this Divine Perſon muſt be the *Only begotten* before the World, foraſmuch as the Divine Scriptures mention no other begotten of the Father before the World, but this Divine Perſon; which has this Title given it, *Wiſd.* vii. 22. *for Wiſdom, which is the Worker of all Things, taught me: for in her is an underſtanding Spi-*

rit,

rit, *Holy*, *Only begotten* (μονογενὴς.) They muſt alſo have known that *God* had a *Son*; *what is his* (God's) *Name*, *and what is his Son's Name?* Prov. xxx. 4. and that this Son is the ſame with *Wiſdom* or the *Only begotten*; otherwiſe *Wiſdom* could not be the *Only begotten*, if there be a Son begotten different from *Wiſdom*; and according to this Doctrine, *John* calls the Son, *the Only begotten Son*, ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, ch. i. *v.* 18. If then, I ſay, the *Jews* could not have been ignorant of theſe great Truths, upon the ſuppoſition of their Knowledge of the Scriptures, and this Knowledge ought to be ſuppoſed, till the contrary be made to appear; that is, if they knew that there was a divine Perſon operating with the Father, from the beginning of the World; and that this Divine Perſon was *the Only begotten Son*; it is no wonder that they underſtood theſe Words, *my Father worketh hitherto*, *and I work*; ſpoken by our Saviour, to be a taking to himſelf the Character of Son of God, who wrought with the Father in the Creation of the World, and operates with him in preſerving and governing it; and by conſequence to be an aſſerting God to be his

his *proper* Father, as *Only begotten*; and himself *Equal* to him, as the *proper* Son of a *proper* Father.

† *Tertullian* says of the Father,

Exinde eum parem sibi faciens, de quo procedendo Filius factus est. adv. Prax. c. 7.

That he made the Word *equal* to *himself*, ever since he proceeded from him, and became his Son.

Cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantiâ aut inæqualitate Divinitatis duos Deos reddidisse videatur. de Trin. c. 31.

Novatian says, Whose (the Son's) *Godhead* is taught us in such manner, as that none may think that two Gods are introduc'd either by a *difference* or *inequality* in the Godhead.

That is, the Divinity of the Son was taught to be *like* to, and *equal* to that of the Father; because otherwise, if it were *unlike*, and *unequal*, their Natures must be different, and Father and Son be distinct Gods.

DXCI. John viii. 58. *Before Abraham was*, I Am.

" The Comment grants, that possi-
" bly our Saviour might hereby intend
" to

" to insinuate——— that he was that " Person, in whom the Name of God " was, *viz. Jehovah*, or, *I Am.*" Which seems to import, as if the Author thought, that *the Name of God* was a distinct thing from the Person, in whom it was; the Consequence of which is, that not the Person of the Son, but the *Name of God* in Him, is *Jehovah*, or *I Am.* Now if this be the Case, the Words would not have proved what our Saviour intended by them, namely, his Existence in the Days of *Abraham.* For the Meaning of them must have been this, *Before Abraham was, the Name I Am existed*; and how could the Existence of *the Name of God* prove the Existence of the Son of God, if the *Son* and *Name* were two different Things? Or would it not be strange Reasoning for a modern Christian to prove his Existence in the Days of Christ, from the Name of Christ, which He bears in Him? Nay, if Christ could call himself *I Am*, as certainly He does, not because He substantially or essentially is so, but because that divine Name is in Him; might not any Christian call himself *Jesus*, because He bears that Name, or

or is baptiz'd into it? If then the Son calls himself *I Am*, He must really be so in his own Nature.

Again, it is suppos'd that the Term ὁ ὤν signifies *the self-existent Being*. If the Meaning be that *Self-existence* is an essential Part of the Idea of *Being*, the Person affirming it is oblig'd to prove it; since others are of Opinion, and with good Reason, that it rather relates to the manner of existing of the first Person in the Divine Being, than to the Nature or Essence of Being it self: And indeed if it be throughly consider'd, it is a positive Term for a negative Idea, and imports no more than that the Person or Subject, of which it is affirm'd, derives not its Existence from another Person. So that the Son in respect of his Divine Nature may receive the Names expressing him (*b*) as *Being*; and yet they, who give them him, not incur the Blame of falling into Sabellianism, or making him *Self-existent*. See N° 340.

(*b*) See N° 616.

As for the Comparison between *Exodus* and *Acts*, which is made to shew that *the Name of God* was in the Angel spoken of in both those Places, which Angel is Christ; if it be meant to prove that

that the Angel or Chriſt, in reſpect of his Divine Nature, is a diſtinct Subject or ſubſtantially different from the *Name of God* in Him; ſuch a Conſtruction of the places compared cannot be approved of; for the Name of the Father is not in the Son, by pure indwelling, but after ſuch a manner, as the real communication of the Divine Nature from the Father to the Son by Generation requires. But if it be intended to ſhew, that the Angel or Chriſt is a diſtinct Subject or Subſtantially different from *the Name of God* in Him, not in reſpect of his Divine Nature, but of a created Nature aſſumed by the *Word* at the beginning of all Things, as the *Firſt-Fruits* of the Creation, and in reſpect of which, He may be more properly and accurately denominated an *Angel*, it may be readily aſſented to as a ſtrong Probability, not a little favoured by the Sacred Writings.

DXCIV. John x. 30. *I and my Father are* † One.

† *One*, not by a bare Unity in Power, but by an Unity of Nature, the Foundation of the Unity in Power.

That the Son is *One* in Nature with the Father, appears from the Divine Names attributed to him; ſuch as *Jehovah*, and *Hu*; which expreſs Him as He is *Being*, *I Am*, and, *Who was, and is, and is to come*; which *Jehovah* or *Being*, is but *One*; *Jehovah our God, Jehovah is One*, Deut. vi. 4. If then theſe Divine Names are alike affirmed of the Father and the Son; if the Name *Jehovah* be given to none but *the one true God*, Exod. iii. 15. Pſal. lxxxiii. 18. and the Name *Hu*, be of the ſame Importance with the Name *Jehovah*, and on that account alike incommunicable; it will follow, that the Father and Son is *the one true God*, *the one Divine Being*, or the *One Jehovah*.

This Unity of Nature and Godhead in Father and Son is confirmed by the Fathers;

Et in quo diſtabit Dei Verbum, imò magis Ipſe Deus, cum ſit Verbum, à verbo Hominum? &c. Lib. 2. c. 18.

Irenæus ſays, Wherein will the *Word of God*, nay, rather *God himſelf*, ſince *He* is the *Word*, differ from the Word of Men? *&c.*

Clem.

Clem. Alexandrinus, Nothing therefore is hated of *God*, nor indeed of his *Word*; for they are both *One*, namely, *God*.

Οὐδὲν ἄρα μισεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου· ἓν γὰρ ἄμφω, ὁ Θεός. Pædag. Lib. 1. c. 8. p. 113.

Again, He who places ſome, *Matt.* xxv. 31, *&c.* at his Right Hand, and others at his Left, being *Good*, as He is conſider'd in the Character of Father, is denominated that only, which He is, namely *Good*; but as He exiſts in the Father in the Character of the Son, his Word is denominated *Juſt*.

Ὁ γὰρ ἱστὰς, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἐξ εὐωνύμων, καὶ τὸ μὲν Πατὴρ νοεῖται, ἀγαθὸς ὤν, αὐτὸ μόνον ὅ ἐστι κέκληται, ἀγαθὸς· καὶ τὸ ὑῷ. ὢν ὁ Λόγ@. αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ἐστι, δίκαι@. προσαγορεύεται. Ibid. p. 118.

In which Words it is evident, that the ſame God judging the World according to *Matt.* xxv. 31, *&c.* is conſider'd under a twofold Subſiſtence of *Father* and *Son*; and that in reſpect of the former He is called *Good*, and of the latter *Juſt*.

Quommodo dictum eſt, Ego & Pater unum ſumus, ad ſubſtantiæ unitatem, *non ad numeri ſingularitatem.* Adv. Prax. c. 25.

Tertullian ſays; As it is ſaid, *I and my Father are One*; to expreſs not the Singularity of Perſon, but the *Unity of Subſtance.*

Cum nullius hominis hæc vox eſſe poſſit, Ego & Pater unum ſumus, *hanc vocem de conſcientiâ divinitatis Chriſtus ſolus edicit.* c. 13.

Novatian; Since this can be the Voice of no meer Man, *I and my Father are One*; Chriſt uttered it alone from a Senſe of his *Godhead.*

Which *Godhead* is founded upon *a Communion of Subſtance* between the Father and the Son; For, ſays He,

Unus Deus oſtenditur verus & æternus Pater, à quo ſolo hæc vis Divinitatis emiſſa, etiam in filium tradita & directa, rurſum per ſubſtantiæ communionem ad Patrem revolvitur, c. 31.

It has been ſhewn that there is One true and eternal God the Father, from whom alone this *Virtue of the Godhead* being emitted, nay, delivered to, and directed towards the Son, returns again to the Father *by a Communion of Subſtance.*

And

And that this *ſubſtantial Virtue of the Godhead*, emitted from the Father, is the very Nature of the Son, appears from the ſame Chapter, where He ſays of the *Word*,

That He is acknowledged to be *a ſubſtantial Virtue* brought forth from God.

In ſubſtantia prolatæ à Deo Virtutis agnoſcitur.

Where Note the Agreement between *ſubſtantiâ prolatæ à Deo Virtutis*, and *vis Divinitatis emiſſa——per ſubſtantiæ communionem.*

DXCV. *John* x. 33. *That Thou* being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf † God.

† *God* in reſpect of the Unity of *Nature*, affirmed of himſelf with the Father, in the Words, *I and my Father are One*, *v.* 30. N° (594) and not in reſpect of a bare Unity in Power: For it does not appear from the Writings of the Old Teſtament, that the *Jews* ever called any one *God*, abſolutely, from the Divine Power communicated to him, except He were true God, or God by Nature; (ſee N° 534) and there-

fore when they charge Chriſt with calling himſelf *God*, abſolutely, becauſe He affirmed himſelf to be *one with the Father*, they muſt underſtand it of an Unity of Nature, that would infer him to be true God, or God by Nature, and not of a bare Unity in Power.

Euſebius founds the *Godhead* of the Son, upon his being *Son of God by Nature*, which ſuppoſes ſuch an Unity of Nature between them, as is between a Natural Father and his Son; his Words are theſe.

Καὶ ὁλόν γε τοῦτο ἄιτιον ἄν εἴη τοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν, τὸ μόνον εἶναι φύσει τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸν, καὶ μονογενῆ χρηματίζειν. Dem. Evang. p. 227.

And all this may be the Reaſon, why He (Chriſt) alſo is God, becauſe He only is *Son of God by Nature*, and called Only Begotten.

Novatian reaſons upon the place juſt as the *Jews* did, for ſays He,

Quomodo enim Ego & Pater unum ſumus, ſi non & eſt Deus & Filius? Qui idcirco unum

How can that ſaying be true, *I and my Father are one*, if He is not both God and Son? (that is *Son*, as He calls Him Father; and

God

God, as he affirms himſelf to be one with Him) who therefore may be ſaid to be *one* (with the Father,) becauſe He is of Him, is his Son, is born of Him, and is found to have come forth from Him (which is oppoſed to being *made* in this Chapter) on which account He is God alſo: And becauſe the *Jews* were offended at this Saying, and held him as a Blaſphemer, becauſe He had ſhewn by theſe Words, that He was *Chriſt the God*, and were ready to ſtone him; He ſtrenuouſly confutes his Adverſaries with the Authority of Scripture, ſaying, *if He called them Gods, unto whom the Word came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of Him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* In which

poteſt dici, dum ex ipſo eſt, & dum Filius ejus eſt, & dum ex ipſo naſcitur, dum ex ipſo proceſſiſſe reperitur, per quod & Deus eſt. Quod cum invidioſum putâſſent Judæi, & blaſphemum credidiſſent, eo quod ſe oſtenderat his ſermonibus Chriſtum eſſe Deum, ac propterea ad lapides concurriſſent, & ſaxorum ictus injicere geſtâſſent, exemplo & teſtimonio Scripturarum adverſarios ſuos fortiter refutavit: ſi illos, inquit, dixit Deos, ad quos verba facta ſunt, & non poteſt ſolvi ſcriptura, quem Pater ſanctificavit & miſit in hunc mundum, vos dicitis, quia

quia blaſphemas, quia dixi, Filius Dei ſum ego? Quibus vocibus neque ſe negavit Deum, quin imo Deum ſe eſſe firmavit. c. 23.

Words He did not deny himſelf to be God, but rather affirmed that He was ſuch.

DXCVII. John xii. 41. *Theſe things ſaid Iſaias, when He ſaw* his Glory, *and ſpake of Him.*

That Chriſt comes in *the glory of the Father*, is true, and that He comes in his *own Glory*, is true alſo; for St. *Luke* ſays, ch. ix. 26. *Of Him ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed, when He ſhall come in his own Glory, and in his Father's.* Which ſuppoſes a perſonal, tho' not a real difference of the Glory of the Son from that of the Father. He came alſo in *the Name* or *Power* of the Father; and He had alſo a *Name* or *Power* of his own, which He preach'd to the *Jews*, as the Object of their Faith, in order to Salvation, *John* iii. 18. *He that believeth not, is condemned already, becauſe He hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* Which *Name*, tho' derived from the Father with his Perſon, was yet as diſtinct from the *Name* of the Father,

as

as his Perſon was from the Perſon of the Father, as appears from the baptiſmal Precept and Form given by our Saviour, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go ye—— and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* It is true alſo that the Perſon of the Father was manifeſted in the Son his ſubſtantial Likeneſs; but then the Son had his own Divine Perſon the ſubſtantial Likeneſs, which He manifeſted to the World. So that the *Glory*, *Name*, and *Perſon* of the Father are manifeſted in, and united with, the *Glory*, *Name*, and *Perſon* of the Son, and that with a ſubſtantial Unity, as has been above proved. As then from the Unity of Eſſence is inferred the Unity of Glory, where the Glory is eſſential; ſo from the Unity of Glory is inferred the Unity of Eſſence: Or if no part of the Glory be eſſential, but only repreſentative, yet foraſmuch as ſuch Repreſentations are intended to inſtruct us about the Things of which they are Repreſentations; if two Perſons are repreſented by one Glory or Appearance, it is natural to conclude it is with this Deſign, that we ſhould believe the two Perſons to be one *Being*, repreſented by the one Glory or Appearance; otherwiſe

wiſe it might be expected that two Perſons diſtinct in Natures ſhould conſtantly be repreſented by diſtinct Appearances, eſpecially ſince it is as eaſie for God, and apparently more convenient for our Inſtruction, to repreſent diſtinct Beings by diſtinct Appearances, as by One only.

But the moſt remarkable thing in the learned Doctor's Note upon the Text, and which I take to be *the Key* of his whole Book, is his confounding *individual Being* and *Perſon*, as if they were Terms of the ſame Importance; and then ranking thoſe among the Followers of *Sabellius*, who hold the Father and Son to be one and the ſame *individual Being*. But if God be *Being*, ὁ ὤν, and *God* be individually *One*, and *Being* individually *One*; and the Son no leſs than the Father *be true God*, as has been already proved, N° 594, 501, 410. then muſt the Father and Son be one and the ſame *individual Being*, that is, there muſt be *two Perſons* in one and the ſame *individual Being*; and therefore *individual Being* and *Perſon* cannot be Terms of the ſame Importance. Otherwiſe if they were, and the Son be a diſtinct *Perſon* from the *Father*,

as

as doubtleſs He is, he muſt be a diſtinct *individual Being*. And ſince the *One true God* is but *one individual Being*; and the *Father* is this *one true God*, the Son, who is a diſtinct individual Being from the Father, muſt be diſtinct from the *one true God*, that is, be no true God himſelf at all; which is contrary to *John* v. 20. See N°. 410.

As for the Authorities, they ſhew indeed that the Father never manifeſted himſelf otherwiſe than through the Son, and that the Son appeared and acted in the Perſon and Name of the Father, yet do not deny, that He appeared and acted in his own Perſon alſo as God, and in the Power and Virtue of his own Name, unitedly with the Perſon and Name of the Father.

DCXVI. Acts vii. 30, 31, 32. *There appeared to Him —— an* Angel of the Lord, *in a flame of Fire in a Buſh.*

And the Voice of the Lord came unto him ſaying, *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob.*

Chriſt

Chriſt having a Divine *Perſon* of his own, did not ſo ſpeak in *the Perſon of the Father*, as to exclude himſelf from being *the God of the Patriarchs*; but gave himſelf that † Name, as being really ſuch, in Union with the Father: Neither do the Teſtimonies ſhew, that He was ſo excluded. See N° 597.

Ipſe igitur Chriſtus cum Patre, vivorum eſt Deus qui locutus eſt Moyſi. Lib. 4. c. 11.

Irenæus tells us, that Chriſt with the Father, is *the God of the Living*, who ſpake to *Moſes*.

Now Chriſt himſelf teaches us, that *the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob is the God of the Living*; Matt. xxii. 32. Chriſt therefore with the Father, is *the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*.

Juſtin Martyr, ſays,

Τὸ ὃ εἰρημένον ἐκ βάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Αβραὰμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ιακὼβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς

That which was ſpoken to *Moſes* out of the Buſh, *I Am that I Am. The God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*,

Jacob, and the God of thy Fathers, ſignifies that thoſe dead (Fathers) continue to be, and are the Men of Chriſt.

πατέρων σου, σημαντικὸν τοῦ καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐκείνους μένειν, καὶ εἶναι ἀυτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπους. Apol. 2. p. 161. Edit. *Steph.*

That is, As the Son proves the Patriarchs to *live to God*, Luke xx. 37, 38, becauſe God calls himſelf the God of the Patriarchs; which ſuppoſes them to be the Object of his Love and Providence: So *Juſtin Martyr* proves them (*a*) *to live to Chriſt*; becauſe the Perſon, who ſpake to *Moſes* out of the Buſh, calls himſelf the God of the Patriarchs; which would be no direct and immediate conſequence, but upon the Suppoſition that Chriſt is the Perſon, who ſpake to *Moſes*, and called himſelf the God of the Patriarchs, or of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*; ſo that it is evident from *Juſtin*, no leſs than from *Irenæus*, that Chriſt, *to whom the Patriarchs live*, is with the Father *the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*; and indeed He affirms Chriſt to be the Perſon, who ſpake thoſe Words out of the Buſh to *Moſes*.

(*a*) Rom. xiv. 8, 9.

It

It is to be obſerved alſo, that he who calls himſelf the God of the Patriarchs, who has been proved to be Chriſt, is ſaid alſo to call himſelf (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν) *I Am that I Am*, or *I Am He who is:* Whence it is evident, that the Son with the Father is *Being itſelf*, and by Conſequence, Neceſſary and Eternal. See N° 591.

† If it be objected that Chriſt gave himſelf the Name of *Jehovah the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham*, &c. Exod. iii. 15. in reſpect of the Father preſent with him, and not in reſpect of his own Perſon, it muſt be obſerved, that the Name *Jehovah* is given to Chriſt, in diſtinction from the Perſon of the Father in the following Text; *The Lord* (Jehovah) *rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, Brimſtone and Fire from the Lord* (Jehovah) *out of Heaven*, Gen. xix. 24. where *Jehovah*, who rains down the Fire and Brimſtone, is the Son; and *Jehovah*, from whom it is rained, is the Father, as is known to thoſe, who are acquainted with the Interpretations of the (*a*) Antients: And if the Supream Name *Jehovah*, doubtleſs any other Name belonging to God, may be given to the Son: If it be further

(*a*) *Not to mention any others, ſee* Apoſt. Conſt. *Lib.* 5. *c.* 20.

ther objected, that the Name *Jehovah*, is ſpoken of the Son in an improper Senſe; that muſt be repeated, which has been obſerved before, that the Name is (*b*) incommunicable to any Being but the true God, and therefore belongs to the Son in the moſt proper Senſe.

(*b*) N° 594.

Philo ſays of *the Word*, or Second Principle, as cited by *Euſebius*,

That He is called the Beginning, and *the Name of God*.

Καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ, καὶ ὄνομα Θεοῦ——προσαγορέυεται. Euſeb. præp. Evang. p. 533.

Now *the Name of God*, emphatically ſo called, is *the Name Jehovah*, which is abſolutely called *the Name*, Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, as being the Chief and Supream Name of God; if then *Philo* ſpoke the Senſe of the learned *Jews* in this Matter, as is highly probable; *the Name Jehovah*, or the Divine Virtue of the Name, did not lodge in the *Word*, as in a diſtinct Subject, but was the very *Word* itſelf, according to the Wiſdom and Tradition of the *Jews*; the Conſequence of which is, that ſince *the Name*, or Thing ſignified by the *Name*, was

was (*a*) *feared*, (*b*) *called upon, and* (*c*) *praiſed by the* Jews, *the Word*, which is the thing ſignified, was the Object of Jewiſh Worſhip; and becauſe the Object of Jewiſh Worſhip is but *One*, who is called the Lord God, or Jehovah Elohijm, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and Him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, Matt. iv. 10. Deut. vi. 13. *Sept.* And it is certain the Father was worſhipped as well as his *Word*; the *Father* and the *Word* are the *one* Object of Jewiſh Worſhip, or the Lord God, who is but *One*, *Deut.* vi. 4. Theſe I ſay are the Conſequences of *Philo*'s Poſition, without a ſtrict Enquiry, how far He carried them in his own Writings; tho' it ſeems to appear with very great Evidence from the Goſpel of St. *John*, and from the Nature of the Reaſoning in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, that the *Jews* had a Notion in the times of our Saviour, that the Word was (*d*) *God*, and One (*e*) with the Father, and the *Object of* (*f*) *Worſhip*.

From the *Jews* proceed we to the Chriſtians, among whom *Clem. Alexandrinus* ſpeaks of *the Son* after much the ſame manner, as *Philo* does of *the Word*. For

(*a*) Deut. xxviii. 58.
(*b*) Pſal. xcix. 6.
(*c*) Pſal. lxviii. 4.
(*d*) John x. 33.
(*e*) Ch. x. 30. See N° 594, 595, 580.
(*f*) Heb. i. 6.

for having cited *Malachi* i. 11, 14. where the *Name* of the Lord of Hoſts is declared to be great and dreadful among the Heathen, and the Object of Worſhip, He asks,

What Name? Among the Faithful, it is *the Son revealing the Father*, Matt. xi. 27. But among the *Gentiles*, it is *God the Creator*.

Ποῖον ὄνομα; ὃν μὲν τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν, ὁ υἱὸς πατέρα μηνύων· ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ἕλλησι, ὁ Θεὸς ποιητής. Strom. 5. p. 613. Edit. *Pariſ.*

In which Words we may obſerve, 1ſt, that *the Son revealing the Father*, or, containing and manifeſting the Father in Himſelf, is the very *Name*, and not the bare Subject, in which it dwells. 2*dly*, That this *Name* is the Object of Worſhip, for it is ſaid, *Malach.* i. 11. *In every place incenſe ſhall be offered unto my Name*, (that is, to the Son manifeſting the Father) *and a pure offering*. 3*dly*, That the Son manifeſting the Father is the ſame Object of Divine Worſhip to the Chriſtians, as God the Creator was to the *Gentiles*; that is, as God was known to, and worſhipped by, the wiſer Heathens in

the Unity of his Nature, and as Creator of the World: So is He known to, and worſhipped by, the Chriſtians in a Diſtinction of Perſons, and more eſpecially in the Perſon of the Son the Redeemer of the World. 4*thly*, That the *Name* manifeſted to the Chriſtians and worſhipped by them is as divine, as the *Name* manifeſted to the *Gentiles*, and worſhipped by them; that is, the Son manifeſting the Father is as true God, as God the Creator; otherwiſe the Chriſtians in their new Diſpenſation, which is a plain Improvement of the State of Nature, would have a Name to truſt in of leſſer Efficacy than the very *Gentiles*. 5*thly*, That therefore the Son manifeſting the Father is *one* with God the Creator, ſince the true God is but *One*.

Note, The Apoſtle tells us, *Acts* iv. 12. that *there is none other Name under heaven* (but the name of Jeſus Chriſt) *given among Men whereby we muſt be ſaved*. Now it is certain that the *Name*, by which the Church is to be ſaved according to the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, is *the Name Jehovah*. For *Joel* ſays of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, as it is applied by St. *Peter*,

ter, *Acts* ii. 21. and by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* x. 13. *That whoſoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord* (or, on *the Name Jehovah*) *ſhall be delivered*, or, *ſaved*, according to the Greek, *Joel* ii. 32. it follows then that the *Name Jeſus*, and *the Name Jehovah* are *One*; for ſo is the name Jehovah as cited out of *Joel* applied to Jeſus Chriſt by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* x. 12, 13. If then Jehovah be incommunicable to † any but the true God, and the true God is but *One*, and Jeſus Chriſt is Jehovah, Jeſus Chriſt is the true God.

† See N° 594.

DCXXII. } *Rom.* xiv. 9, 10, 11, 12,
DCXXIII. } *&c.* For to this End Chriſt both died, and roſe, and revived, that He might be *Lord* (κυριεύσῃ) *both of the Dead and Living*, &c.

Theſe and the following words ſeem to import ſomething more than that God ſhall judge the World by Jeſus Chriſt; namely, that Jeſus Chriſt is himſelf both *Lord and God*, as may appear by looking back, and conſidering that theſe words are the Proof of a Truth aſſerted, *v.* 7, 8. *That no Be-*

liever lives or dies to himſelf but to the Lord, (κυρίῳ·) and the whole Reaſoning runs thus, Chriſt died, roſe again, and lived, that He might be *the Lord* (κυρίευσῃ) both of the Dead and Living; the Faithful therefore, who live in, or depart out of this World, ought ſo to live in, or depart out of it, as that, if they continue in it, they may live to *the Lord* (κυρίῳ) or to the Perſon who roſe again that He might be *Lord* of the Living; or, if they depart out of it, may die to *the Lord,* who himſelf died that He might be *Lord* of the Dead. Thus far then it is clear that Chriſt is *Lord.* But let us go a little more backward, and we ſhall find that the general Aſſertion, *none of us liveth and dieth to himſelf, but to Chriſt the Lord of the Dead and Living,* is laid down to prove a particular Truth, *v.* 6. that the Obſervation or Non-obſervation of Days by the Faithful, and their Eating or not Eating are acts of Worſhip to the Lord. And the Reaſoning is thus; No Believer lives to himſelf, but to Chriſt *the Lord of the Living*: All Acts therefore done by them in this Life, or Ceſſation from Acts, are to the Glory of the Lord;

Lord; obſerving of Days, or not obſerving, Eating or not Eating, are Acts of this Life, or a Ceſſation from Acts; therefore they are done by the Faithful to the Glory of Chriſt *the Lord of the Living*: Which is the Reaſon why none of the Faithful, whether weak or ſtrong, ſhould on theſe Accounts be condemn'd by their Brethren. So that it is ſtill evident that Chriſt is *the Lord* underſtood in the Context. If then Eating or not Eating be to the Glory of Chriſt, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that *the Thankſgiving offered* on either Occaſion, *v.* 6. are to his Glory alſo; and that He is *the God*, or comprehended in *the God*, to whom they are offered; for thus are the words, *He that eateth, eateth to the Lord* (Chriſt) *for He giveth God thanks. And He that eateth not, to the Lord* (Chriſt) *He eateth not, and giveth God thanks*, v. 6. But it is yet more probable that Chriſt is comprehended in the Name *God*, if we retire to *v.* 1, 2, 3, where the Apoſtle exhorts the *Romans* to receive a weak Brother, and Him that eateth not, as well as Him that eateth, becauſe God hath received them both. Which He repeats *c.* xv. *v.* 7. *Wherefore receive ye one another*,

as Christ also received us, to the glory of God, putting *Christ* in the place of *God*, as if He were comprehended in that Name. But let us take a View forwards, as we have done backwards; it is written *v.* 10. *we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ.* And to prove this, the following words are cited out of *Isaiah*, † *As I live saith the Lord* (Jehovah) *every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God*; that is, to *Jehovah*, which the Septuagint take from the beginning of the next Verse, where it is placed according to the modern way of Pointing. And then from this Proof and Argument the Apostle repeats the Proposition to be proved, which was *that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ*, with some Variation in the following Terms, *So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God*, making these two Expressions *standing before the judgment seat of Christ*, and *giving an account to God*, to be equivalent. Now if it did not appear from Scripture, that the Son in his own Person as well as the Father was called Jehovah, which is rendered here by the Name *God*; and that Jehovah was

† Ch. xlv. 23, 24.

the

the ſpecial and diſtinguiſhing Name of God, *Exod.* iii. 15. and that the Being meant by it was *one* only, *Deut.* vi. 4. it might be conceived that *ſtanding before the judgement ſeat of Chriſt* was no *otherwiſe giving an account to God*, than in the Perſon of his Vicegerent, who bare his Authority, but was not God in his own Perſon: But ſince the contrary appears, and the Perſon ſwearing, *that every knee ſhall bow to Him, and every tongue ſhall confeſs to God*, is Jehovah; and Chriſt is acknowledged to have been the Perſon that generally manifeſted himſelf to the *Jewiſh* Nation; it will be a ſtrong Preſumption that Jehovah ſpeaking by the Prophet *Iſaiah* was the Son of God; and that the Apoſtle knowing this, cited the place as a direct Proof that we were *all to ſtand before the judgment ſeat of Chriſt*, and called him *the God to whom all are accountable.*

And thus *Irenæus* underſtood it as it is cited *Philip.* ii. 10, 11. for ſays He,

Ἵνα Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρι καὶ βασιλεῖ, κατ' εὐδοκίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἀοράτου, πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων, καὶ ἐπιγείων, καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται αὐτῷ. Lib. I. c. 2.

That every Knee of things in Heaven, and in Earth, and under the Earth, might according to the good Pleasure of the invisible Father bow to Christ Jesus our *Lord and God*, and Saviour, and King, and every Tongue might confess to him.

And *Novatian* says,

Neq; enim, si non & Deus esset Christus, omne se in nomine ejus genu flecteret cœlestium, & terrestrium, & infernorum. c. 17.

For neither, if Christ were not God also, would every Knee of things in Heaven, and in Earth, and under the Earth, bow in, or to, his Name.

DCLXII. Heb. xiii. 8. *Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. Or rather, yesterday, and to day, and for ever* † He. See ch. i. v. 12.

The Comment tells us the meaning is, "*That the Doctrine of Christ* once "taught

" taught by the Apoſtles ought to be " preſerved unchanged." So that Jeſus Chriſt here is *the Doctrine of Chriſt*; as *the true God*, N° 410. is *the true Religion*. But I believe it will appear both from the Words, and the Context, that the Perſon of Chriſt, and his eternal Exiſtence, in reſpect of paſt and future Duration are underſtood by them. *Chapter* xii. the Apoſtle had been exhorting the *Hebrews* not to apoſtatize from the Faith of Chriſt, on account of any Troubles and Diſcouragements they might meet with from their Adverſaries. And here *Chap.* xiii. *v.* 7. He propoſes their own Paſtors for an Example, whom he encourages them to imitate in the Conſtancy of their Faith; the Object of which was Jeſus Chriſt, who was no Perſon of a modern Date, unable to ſuſtain the Weight of ſo great a Confidence repoſed in Him; but was God Eternal, or a Divine Being without Beginning, and without End; on whom the Church was at firſt founded, does at preſent reſt, and will be fix'd and eſtabliſh'd to all Eternity, ſo that they might ſafely truſt in Him, without fear and danger of Diſappointment.

† That

† That the Name *He* attributed to Christ is Divine, and argues Him to be *(d) God*, *Justin* is Witness, who says,

(d) See N° 594.

Ἡ γὰρ Αὐτὸς ἀντωνυμία τὸ ὄντως ὂν θεὸν σημαίνει. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 22. Edit. *Steph.*

That the Pronoun *He* signifies Him, who is truely *God*.

Ipse *verò Idem est quod* est, *veluti Moysi famulo suo dixit, Ego sum Qui Sum.* in Epist. ad Heb. c. 1. v. 12.

Ambrose says, *He*, is the same with *that which is*; as He said to his Servant *Moses*, *I Am that I Am.*

The Cabalistick *Jews* placed הוא among the Divine Names.

Origen understands it as expressing the immutability of God:

Ἀλλ' ὁ Ἰουδαϊκὸς καὶ Χριστιανῶν Λόγος, ὁ τὸ ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τοῦ Θεοῦ σπουδῆς, ἀσεβὴς εἶναι νενόμισται, ἐπεὶ μὴ συνασεβεῖ τοῖς ἀσεβῆ περὶ Θεοῦ φρονοῦσιν.

But the Doctrine (says He) of the *Jews* and *Christians*, which asserts the immutability and unchangeableness of God, is accounted impious, because it falls not in with the Impiety

Impiety of thoſe, who think impiouſly of God, but teaches us to ſay in our Prayers to God, *Thou art He.*

νῆσι, λέγων ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐυχαῖς· Σὺ ὁ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ. Cont. Celſ. Lib. 1. p. 17.

Again; We ſay that the Divine Scriptures affirm God to be immutable in this Expreſſion, *But Thou art He.*

Ἡμεῖς μὲν ἔν γε τοῖς θείοις γράμμασι παρίσαμεν ἄτρεπτον λέγοντα τὸν Θεὸν, ἔνθε φησὶ, Σὺ ὁ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ. Lib. 4. p. 169.

I think it is plain that *Origen*, in citing the words, *But thou art He*, refers to *Pſal.* cii. 27. *Heb.* i. 12. where they are only written, ſo far as I know, in the ſame Order and Number as they are here cited. Now ſince the Apoſtle *Paul* explains them of the Perſon of Chriſt, and the Learned *Origen* skilful in Scripture could not be ignorant of it, He muſt be ſuppoſed to uſe them in the ſame Senſe that the Apoſtle explained them in, and to comprehend Chriſt in the notion of the *immutable and unchangeable God.* Which He ſeems to do from the Context of the latter Citation. For *Celſus* having objected to the Chriſtians that it was impoſſible for God

God to deſcend, and take upon him a mortal Body, without ſuffering an eſſential Change in his divine Nature, *p.* 169, 171. *Origen* anſwers him by explaining the true Meaning of God's deſcending, *p.* 169. which He had done before *p.* 168. and to which He refers him, and tells Him that notwithſtanding this Deſcent, God remain'd immutable in his own Nature. That what deſcended to Men was in the Form of *God*, *p.* 169. or, was *the immortal* † *God the Word*, *p.* 170. who ſuffered no eſſential Change, tho' He emptied himſelf to be comprehended of Men. Which He proceeds to prove after the ſame manner as He had proved God to be immutable, *p.* 169. that is, as He had proved that by his deſcending to Men God was not chang'd, as *Celſus* ſuppoſed, from *Good* to *Evil*, from *Beautiful* to *Deformed*, from *Happy* to *Miſerable*, and from the *Beſt* to the *Worſt*; becauſe *He remained* (*a*) *unchangeable in his nature*, and did no more than (*b*) condeſcend or accommodate himſelf by the Œconomy of his Providence to human Affairs: So does He prove of God the Word, that He ſuffered by his Deſcent no ſuch Change

† Ὁ ἀθάνατος Θεὸς Λόγος.

(*a*) Μένων τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἀτρεπτος.

(*b*) Συγκαταβαίνει.

Change from *Good* to *Evil*, &c. running through all the Particulars: And adds, that if *Celſus* thinks He muſt be changed on the account of his taking upon him a mortal Body and an human Soul, He ought to be inſtructed that *the Word, remaining in* (c) *its nature the Word*, ſuffers none of thoſe Changes which the Body and Soul do; but becomes Fleſh by way of (d) *Condeſcenſion*, &c. Since then the Word is God according to *Origen*, and his *Immutability* is proved by the ſame Arguments as that of God is, I think it is plain that the Son was comprehended under *the immutable God* by this Learned Father. Nay, his calling the Word *the immortal God*, ſeems to be done with an intent to ſhew *Celſus*, that the *Word* was *ever* † *the ſame*; which is *Celſus*'s Definition of *immortal*, *p.* 169. and that He was guilty of an Abſurdity in affirming *the immortal God* to be changed by his Deſcent into a mortal Body, *p.* 170, 171.

(c) Ὁ Λόγος τῇ οὐσίᾳ μένων Λόγος.

(d) Συγκαταβαίνων.

† Καλὰ τὰ αὐτὰ, ἢ ὡσαύτως ἔχειν.

As for *Yeſterday*, *to Day*, and *for Ever*, it falls in with, * *Who is, and was, and is to come*, a Name that expreſſes the *eternal* Exiſtence of God.

* Rev. i. 8.

Ambroſe

Heri, propter æternitatem. Lib. 5. de Fide. c. 2.

Ambroſe ſays, *Yeſterday*, becauſe of his *Eternity*.

Τὸ χθὲς, ἢ παρελθόντα πάντα λέγει χρόνον· τὸ σήμερον, τὸ συνεστῶτα· ὁ αἰὼν, τὸ ἄπειρον, καὶ λῆξιν ἐκ ἔχον. In loc.

Chryſoſtom; *Yeſterday* ſignifies all the paſt time. *To Day*, the preſent. And *for Ever*, that which has no End.

DCCLXXIII. *Mark* xiii. 32. *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven*, neither the Son, *but the Father.*

It may be ſuppoſed, that, when theſe words were ſpoken, the Humanity of the Son had no Knowledge of the Time of his coming to Judgment, becauſe it was illuminated by degrees. *Luk.* ii. 52. and probably received the knowledge of it with other Revelations after his Aſcenſion into Heaven and Glorification there, *Rev.* i. 1. and v. 4, 5. *Irenæus* indeed ſeems to have underſtood the Paſſage of the Divinity of Chriſt, but may be very well explain'd by

by the Citation out of *Basil*; who means nothing more by the Son's Ignorance, than that the Father is the Fountain of all Knowledge, which is derived to the Son with his Essence from the Father: For that *Irenæus* believ'd that the Son knew all things is evident from the following words:

How cou'd therefore that which is produced by *Ignorance* and Defect contain Him (the Word) *who has the knowledge of all things*, and is true and perfect?

Quomodo igitur ignorantiæ & Labis emissio eum qui continet universorum agnitionem, & sit verus & perfectus, portare potuit? Lib. 5. c. 18.

Clem. Alexand. was of the same Mind, for says he

Ignorance does not approach *God*, who was the Father's Counsellor before the Foundation of the World. For this is the *Wisdom*, which God Almighty delighted in.

Ἄγνοια γὰρ οὐκ ἐγγίζει τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου συμβούλῳ γενομένῳ τῷ Πατρὸς· αὕτη γάρ σοφία ἣ προσέχαιρεν ὁ Παντοκράτωρ Θεός. Strom. 7. p. 703.

DCCCXXX. *My Father is* † greater *than I.*

† *Greater* as He is Father; not in reſpect of the Divine Nature, which is the ſame in both.

DCCCCXXXIV. Phil. ii. 6, 7. *Who being in the Form of God* (as He is God the Word) *thought it not robbery to be equal with God* († Did not take upon him at his firſt appearance in the World an Equality with God, or appear in the Glory and Power of his Divine Nature.) *But made himſelf of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant; and was made in the likeneſs of Man,* (or emptied himſelf, by taking upon him the form of a Servant, being made in the likeneſs of Men.)

† It muſt be obſerved that Chriſt *the ſecond Man,* the Lord (*a*) from Heaven, coming into the World to redeem Mankind, took contrary Steps to bring it about, to thoſe that were made by the firſt Man, who ruined himſelf and the

(*a*) 1 Cor. xv. 47.

the Creation with him. As for Inſtance, the firſt *Adam* had an ambitious Deſire of becoming *as God* (כֵּאלֹהִים,) that is, *equal with*, or like to God; of the ſame meaning with, ἴσα Θεῷ, *Phil.* ii. 6. as the Particle (כ) is render'd, *Job* xxix. 14. where כְּסָעִיל *as a Robe* is in the *Sept.* ἴσα διπλοΐδι, *equal* or like *to a Robe*; and to compaſs his Deſire violated the Laws, and trampled on the Authority of God his Creator: But the ſecond *Adam*, the Son of God, tho' himſelf *God*, was ſo far from attempting to ſhew himſelf *as God*, or *equal with God* by violent Methods, that He would not appear to be that which He is, or come into the World in the proper Splendor of his Divine Nature, but concealed his Glory under *the form of a Servant*, or the human Nature.

† The Divine Nature of the Son did not *empty* itſelf of its *Glory*, which was Eſſential, nor of *the Form of God*, which was the Divine Nature itſelf, being entirely (*a*) immutable. But conceal-ed its Majeſty under *the Form of a Servant*: That is, the Son relatively, and in regard of Men, was as it were *emptied* of his Glory, becauſe the *Jews*

(*a*) See *Orig.* cont. Celſ. lib. 4. p. 170. & N°662.

could not discern it thro' the Vail of his Flesh; but absolutely He was not. And in this Sense is the Text understood by the following Writers.

Exhausit semetipsum acceptâ effigie Servi. adv. Marc. Lib. 5. c. 20.

Tertullian says, He emptied himself, by taking on Him the Form of a Servant.

Si Christus exinanitur in eo quod nascitur, formam servi accipiendo, &c. c. 17.

Novatian; If Christ was emptied in being born, and taking on him the Form of a Servant, *&c.*

Πῶς ἐκένωσε; μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. In loc.

Chrysostom; How did He empty himself? By taking upon him the Form of a Servant.

If it be further enquired, how the taking upon him the Form of a Servant was understood to be an emptying; it is explain'd thus by *Theodoret*,

Θεὸς ὢν, οὐκ ἐωρᾶτο Θεὸς, τῇ ἀνθρωπείαν περικείμενος φύσιν. In Loc.

Tho' He was God, He was not discerned to be God, by reason of his being cloathed with the Human Nature. That

That is, The Glory of the Godhead was so vailed and concealed under the Man, as if it were not there; and this Concealment was the emptying.

Again, He hid his Majesty. Τὴν ἀξίαν κατακρύψας. Ibid.

Which is *Jerome*'s Sense upon the Place,

He hid, what He was, by Humility. *Quod erat, humilitate celavit.* In loc.

Novatian is more particular, and says,

It would have been more truly said of Christ, That He was enriched when He was born, than emptied; except it had been on this Account, that the Authority of the Divine Word, resting from the Exercise of its own Strength, in order to take upon it the Nature of Man, humbled and depressed it self for a cer-

De quo verius dictum fuisset locupletatum illum esse tunc, quum nasceretur, non exinanitum; nisi quoniam autoritas Divini Verbi ad suscipiendum hominem interim conquiescens, nec se suis viribus exercens, dejicit se ad

ad tempus atq; deponit, dum hominem fert, quem ſuſcepit. c. 17.

tain Seaſon, while it bore the Man whom it took upon it.

Exinanivit ſe dum ad injurias contumeliaſq; deſcendit; dum audit infanda, experitur indigna. Ibid.

And again; He emptied himſelf while he condeſcended to the bearing of Injuries and Reproaches; while He heard Words that ought not to have been ſpoken to him, and experienced things that ought not to have been done.

The Senſe of the former of which Paſſages is expreſſed thus by St. *Ambroſe*,

Sed ſemetipſum exinanivit. *Poteſtatem ſuam ab opere retraxit, ut humiliatus otiosâ virtute infirmior videretur.* In loc.

But He emptied himſelf. He with-held his Power from acting; that being humbled by the Inactivity of his Power, He might ſeem weak.

The Sum of the Doctrine is this; That the Son of God *emptied himſelf*, or concealed his Glory and Power by taking

taking upon him human Nature, and bearing the Indignities offered him in it, thro' the ſuſpenſion of the Acts of his Divine Power; ſo that He ſeemed to Men to be void of that Power, which was eſſential to him and inſeparable from him. For if He were really, and abſolutely emptied of his Glory, or ſeparated from it, it is impoſſible it ſhould ever have been eſſential to him, or He himſelf have been true God; nor could the Glory of the Divinity have been mentally diſcerned by the Apoſtles themſelves thro' the Vail of the Fleſh, if it had not been there; as St. *John* tells us it was, c. i. 14. *And we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father*, in which Senſe it is underſtood by *Euſeb. de Eccleſ. Theol. Lib.* 1. *p.* 85. and it is not improbable but that the Brightneſs of his Perſon, when tranſfigured upon the Mount, was the Effect of the Eruption of this concealed Glory.

The Comment indeed ſuppoſes, That Chriſt Jeſus emptied himſelf *of that Form of God which He before poſſeſſed*: which ſeems to import, That He did not poſſeſs it in his State of emptineſs. Now if He was God, as being in *the*

Form of God, his loſing the Poſſeſſion of *the Form* was loſing his Godhead; and ſince his State of emptineſs, was one and the ſame with his State of humiliation in a Body of Fleſh, and the loſs of the Poſſeſſion was in his State of emptineſs, it will follow that He was not God, or poſſeſſed of the Godhead in his State of humiliation in a Body of Fleſh, which is contrary to Scripture, that tells us, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, 1 Tim. iii. 16. calling him *God* while He was yet in the Fleſh, or in his State of humiliation. But further, If He was not poſſeſſed of the *Form of God*, or of the Godhead in his State of emptineſs, and manifeſtation in the Fleſh, as He could never have been real God, becauſe otherwiſe, *the Form of God*, or the Godhead, would have been eſſential to him and inſeparable from him; ſo could He never have been the Mediator between God and Men, and have reconciled us to God; that Character and Office, requiring a Perſon, who equally conſiſted of both Natures, according to the reaſoning of the Antients, N° 501. So that the Conſequence of the Suppoſition, overturns the Foundation of our Chriſtian hope. If then the Learned

Author

Author believes that the Son is true God, He must mean ſomething leſs than is here imagined, and the Words ſeem to import, when He ſays, That Chriſt Jeſus emptied himſelf *of that Form of God which he before poſſeſſed.* But if He looked upon Chriſt Jeſus, to have been a mixt Being before his Incarnation, conſiſting of God the Word, and an intellectual Nature made and aſſumed by him, as the Firſt-fruits of his Creatures holy to the Lord; it may be well conceived, how the created Nature in a qualified Senſe, might be ſaid to empty it ſelf, of ſomething it poſſeſſed from the immediate Union, and glorious Irradiation of the Divine Nature, when it came into Fleſh.

Origen was of this Mind, when He ſaid, that

The *Word* ſuffered no Change in it ſelf, when out of its great Love to Mankind it cauſed a Saviour (meaning its own pre-exiſting Human Soul) to come down to them.

Καὶ τί ἄτοπον ἀπαντᾶν τῷ λόγῳ, ἀπὸ πολλῆς φιλανθρωπίας καταβιβάζοντι Σωτῆρα τῷ γένει Ἀνθρώπων; Cont. Celſ. Lib. 4. p. 172.

Ἑκουσίως εἰς τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας κήδεας ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν καλαβᾶσα. Ibid.

Which Soul, He ſays, *voluntarily* deſcended for our Sakes into the frail and ſorrowful Condition of Men.

And then having affirmed, That the Scripture talks much of this humiliation and condeſcenſion of the Soul of the *Word* to Sorrow and Suffering, chooſes out of all the reſt, *Phil.* ii. 5, *&c.* to prove and confirm it, thereby ſhewing, That He underſtood all that was ſaid there of Chriſt's *emptying* and *humbling* himſelf, to belong to his *Soul* and not to the *Word*, which he makes to be *immutable*. *p.* 170.

Now whether the Learned Dr. were of this Mind or not, it would have been more inſtructing and ſatisfactory to the Reader, if he had propoſed his Sentiment with a little more Clearneſs.

DCCCCXXXVII. Coloſſ. i. 15. *Who is the Image of the* inviſible God, *the Firſt-born of every Creature.*

Without ſtrictly enquiring, whether the Son be called the *Firſt-born of every Creature*,

Creature, in reſpect of his Eternal Generation, or of his coming forth in order to Creation; it may be worth our obſerving, That the coming forth of the Son from the Father, is differently expreſſed in Scripture, and, as it is probable, according to the different Views, in which the Sacred Writers ſpake of him: As for Inſtance, The Ancients thought, that the Prophet *David* ſpoke of the Production of the Son, in the following Words, † *My heart is inditing a good Matter*, or, a good Word, *Heb.* λόγον ἀγαθὸν, *Sept.* which if it be true, it muſt be concluded, That *David* conſidered the Son as Light of Light, or as the *Word* and *Truth* conceived in the Mind or Heart of the Father; for ſo the Heart is uſed for the Principle of Thought by the *Jewiſh* Writers; and then it is no wonder that the Word רחש rendered *Enditing*, was uſed by the Prophet, as probably expreſſing the *riſing up of a Thought* in the Mind or Underſtanding hot with Contemplation. But again, when the Scriptures ſpeak of him, as *the proper Son of God* (*a*) who is his (*b*) *proper Father*, it may reaſonably be concluded, That the Sacred Writers conſider'd him as

† Pſal. xlv. 1.

(*a*) Τῦ ἰδίυ υἱῦ. Rom. viii. 32.

(*b*) Πατέρα ἴδιον, Joh. v. 18.

as the Fruit of the whole Perſon and Nature of the Father, or as the Offſpring † *of his Love*; and therefore expreſs'd his coming forth by the Term *Generation*, as ſignifying the Production of a Being in the Power of Love, of the ſame Nature and Perfections with the Parent.

† The Apoſtle calls the Son, *The Son of God's Love*, τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, *Coloſſ.* i. 13. That is, not only *the Object of his Love*, or the Perſon *in whom He is well pleaſed*, Matt. iii. 17. but alſo the ſubſtantial Fruit and Product of his Love, or of his * whole Nature, thro' Love.

Clem. Alexand. calls him

Ὁ πεχθεὶς ἐξ ἀγάπης χαρπὸς, ἀγάπη. Quis Dives, &c. p. 97. §. 37.

Love, as being the Fruit brought forth by Love.

Which if it be true of his Relative Exiſtence, is much more ſo of his Abſolute and Eternal.

* I cannot but take notice of a saying of *Origen*, which in its plain and natural Conſequence ſhews us, That He held the Son to proceed from the whole Perfection of the Father. His ſaying is this,

I think that the Son is the Effulgency of the *whole Glory* of God.

Ὅλης μὲν ἓν οἶμαι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπαύγασμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός. Orig. in Joan. p. 416.

Now the Son is not a Being of one Perfection, but of many. *He is the Holy One, the True One,* (*a*) *the Juſt One* (*b*) *the Image of God's goodneſs,* (*c*) or, *the Son of his Love,* (*d*) *the mighty God,* (*e*) or, *the Breath of the Power of God Eternal Life,* (*f*) and abſolutely *God.* (*g*), or *the true God* (*h*). Which includes all Perfections. If then the Son as *Light* proceeds from *the whole Glory* of the Father: Is there any Reaſon, why as Holy, True, Juſt, Good, Mighty, Life it ſelf, and true God, He ſhould not proceed from the whole Holineſs, Truth, Juſtice, Goodneſs,

(*a*) Rev. iii. 7. (*b*) Acts iii. 14. (*c*) Wiſd. vii. 26. (*d*) Coloſ. i. 12. (*e*) Iſai. ix. 6. Wiſ. vii. 25. (*f*) 1 Joh. i. 2. ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ζωὴ. Life by Nature. *Frag. Juſt. ex Spicil. Sect.* 2. *p.* 172. Τὴν ὄντως ζωὴν. Truly Life. *C. Alexand. Strom.* 7. *p.* 708. (*g*) John i. 1. (*h*) 1 John v. 20.

neſs, Might, Life, and Godhead of the Father, and be the Fruit and Offspring of his whole Nature?

In Page 185. it is affirmed, " That " the Antients from certain Expreſſions " of Scripture, took occaſion to ſpeak " as if the *Son of God* was produced " by the Father juſt before the Crea- " tion of the World; but that the " Words of Scripture gave no Ground " for ſuch Speculations.

Whatever the Opinion of this learned Gentleman may be concerning the meaning of the Scripture Expreſſions, it ſeems to be certain, that the Antients, who took occaſion from them to aſſert the Generation of the Son, in order to Creation, thought they were a ſufficient Ground for ſuch their Aſſertion. And ſince theſe Antients are in great Numbers, and ſome of them in the moſt early Times, let the Reader judge which of the two may be preſumed to be the beſt Witneſſes, or Interpreters of Scripture.

As for the Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, it was uſually taken by Heathen, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian

Chriſtian Authors for the Thoughts of the Mind. And the Chriſtian Writers conſidering the Father under the Character of *Mind*, or as an intellectual Nature, ſpoke of the Son as the Conception of the Mind, calling Him Λόγον ἐνδιάθετον, and νοῦν, as it ſtands for the Thoughts, and not for the Faculty. But then as they did not look upon the Father to be a bare intellectual Power, when they called him *Mind*, but a Divine Perſon, naturally and neceſſarily furniſhed and compleated with all Perfection: So muſt they not be ſuppoſed to have conceived the Son, when they called Him *Thought*, as the bare Effect of the ſimple Faculty of conceiving and underſtanding, but as a Divine Perſon, the adequate Fruit of ſo compleat a Mind and intellectual Nature, as the Perſon of the Father. Thus *Athenagoras* * calls God the Father, an (*a*) *Eternal Mind*; and agreeably to this firſt Notion, That which is brought forth by him, (*b*) *Thought* or *Word*. And becauſe an *Eternal Mind*, can never be ſuppos'd to be void of *Thought*, He makes it (*c*) eternally *thoughtful*, or the *Thought* to be co-exiſtent with the *Mind*. This *Eternal Thought*

* P. 38. Edit. *Oxon.*

(*a*) Νοῦς ἀΐδιος.

(*b*) Νοῦς ἦν ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Πατρός.

(*c*) Ἀϊδίως Λογικὸς.

Thought came forth and manifeſted it ſelf in order to create, and is *the Son of God*. If then *Athenagoras* underſtood the whole Perſon of God the Father, by the *Eternal Mind*, as it is evident He did; the *Thought* of ſuch a *Mind*, muſt be the Off-ſpring of the whole Perſon of God the Father; and therefore the *Thought* or *Word* coming forth to create, muſt have been as Real and Perſonal a Subſiſtence before, as it was after the coming forth. For otherwiſe it is inconceivable, how the bare coming forth without Creation, and it is mentioned as a bare coming forth, ſhould make, or be thought to make, a pre-exiſting Thing become a Perſon, which was none before.

Theophilus ſpeaks of the Son after the ſame manner, † firſt as a * *Thought* Eternally exiſting in the Mind of God, which was alſo his Counſelor. *Secondly*, as a *Voice*, or as the ſame Eternal Thought, uttered and ſpoken forth, in order to create: Which ſhews, That He believed the Son to be a diſtinct Perſon from the Father from all Eternity, partly by his calling him *Counſelor* before his coming forth, which is a Perſonal Character; partly by

† Ad Autol. p. 81, 129. Edit. *Oxon.*

* Τὸν λόγον τ ὄντα ἀεὶ παρὸν τοῖς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. —— νῦν δὲ φερόμενον.

by his affirming him after his coming forth, when He was doubtleſs a Perſon, to be the very ſame *Thought*, that eternally exiſted in the Mind of God; which evidently infers him to have been a Perſon before. Nay, his Reaſoning argues him to be *Son*, while He was yet concealed in the Heart of God, which is as Perſonal a Name as any that can be given.

Tatian ſeems to have been of the ſame Mind with the two preceding Writers. For the * *Power of the Word*, or *rational Power*, which is ſpoken of §. xi. as a Perſon, is mentioned as exiſting before his coming forth, §. vii. So that the Word according to all theſe Writers, was a Real Perſon preſent with the Father, and diſtinct from him, before his coming forth in order to create.

* Λόγε δύναμιν· λογικῆς δυνάμεως.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the HOLY SPIRIT *of* GOD.

DCCCCXCVIII. MATT. iv. 1. *Then was Jesus led up of the* * *Spirit into the Wilderness.*

Concerning the Son's *emptying* himself, N° 934.

* It is not to be supposed, That the *Word* so far *emptied himself*, and *concealed* his Glory under the Vail of Flesh, and suspended his Acts, as to leave the Humanity to the sole Conduct of the *Holy Spirit*. For if this were true, then was our Salvation wrought out, not by the *Word* made Flesh, or by the Second Person of the Trinity united to Man, but by the Holy

Holy Ghoſt. The Truth then appears to be this; That as the Father works thro' the Son in the Holy Ghoſt; ſo the *Word* works from the Father thro' the Spirit, and that this Œconomy was obſerved in the Human Nature; the Father working with and through the Son, *Joh.* v. 17, 19. and the *Word* in the Fleſh, working with and through the Spirit; ſo that the whole Trinity, or the Father, and the *Word* in the Spirit, wrought in and thro' the Man aſſumed by the Word. For that the *Word* was not Idle in the Human Nature, in relation to Acts of Mercy and Goodneſs, is evident from hence, that it was a Light that inſtructed, and a Life that quickned, *John* i. 4, 9, 12, 18: and 11, 25, *&c.* Nay, all his Acts of Patience and Goodneſs; his Victory over the World, and his Reſurrection from the Dead, and Aſcenſion into Heaven, are attributed by *Irenæus*, to the Influence of the *Word*. His Words are theſe,

Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἵνα πειρασθῇ, οὕτω καὶ λόγος ἵνα δοξασθῇ· ὑποχαλῶν ὁ μὲν λόγος ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι καὶ σταυροῦσθαι καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν· συγγινόμενος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ νικᾶν, καὶ ὑπομένειν, καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀνίστασθαι, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι. Lib. 3. c. 21.

For as He was *Man*, that He might be tempted: So was He the *Word*, that He might be glorified. *The Word indeed* † *reſting* (here is its emptying it ſelf) in regard of the Temptation, Crucifixion, and dying of the Man; but being preſent with, or aſſiſting him, in regard of his Conqueſt, Patience, Goodneſs, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion. † See N° 934.

MV. *Luke* iv. 18. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*, becauſe He hath *anointed* me to preach the Goſpel to the Poor.

Irenæus's Comment upon this Place is very proper,

Nam ſecundum id quod Verbum Dei Homo erat, ex radice Jeſſe, & Filius Abrahæ, ſe-

As the Word of God was Man, of the Root of *Jeſſe*, and the Son of *Abraham*, in this reſpect *did the Spirit of God reſt upon him*

him (*Eum*, the Man, not the Word) and He was *anointed* to preach the Goſpel to the Meek.

cundum hoc requieſcebat Spiritus Dei ſuper Eum, *& ungebatur ad evangelizandum humilibus.* Lib. 3. c. 10.

MLVI. *Acts* xxviii. 25, 26, 27. Well ſpake the *Holy Ghoſt* by *Iſaiah* the Prophet unto our Fathers, ſaying, *Go unto this People, and ſay*, &c. —— *and I ſhould heal them.*

The Glory which appear'd to *Iſai. chap.* vi. is the Glory of the Father, *Revelat.* iv. 8. and of the Son, *Joh.* xii. 41. and in this Place, of the Holy Ghoſt. For the *Glory*, or Lord, which ſpake to the Prophet, is called here the Holy Ghoſt. Now ſince Three Perſons are manifeſted in one Glory, and Manifeſtations are intended to bring us into the Knowledge of the Things manifeſted, it is a great Probability, that the one Glory teaches us the Unity or Identity of Nature, of the Perſons manifeſted in it. See N° 597.

It is worth obſerving, That it is no ſtrange thing with the *Jews*, to put *Holy Ghoſt* in the place of *God*, as if they were one and the ſame Being.

Rab. Ob. De Bartinora, ſays, At the time of Deſtruction, *God* was ſad for the Misfortunes of his People; and then the Angels would have comforted him; but the *Holy Ghoſt* anſwered, Haſten not to comfort *Me*. *In Notis in Tract. de Part. Capit. Pars* 4. *Leg. Miſch. p.* 460.

The Sea heard the Voice of the *Holy Ghoſt* (*Jehovah*, Exod. xiv.) which ſpake to *Moſes* out of the midſt of the Fire. *Addit. ad Paraph. Chald. Brev. in* Exod. xiv. 21.

The *Holy Ghoſt* (The Lord of Hoſts, *Hag.* i. 9.) anſwered them, *becauſe of mine Houſe that is waſte. Tractat. de Patr. c.* 4. which will explain thoſe Expreſſions, in which the Church is called the *Temple of the Holy Ghoſt.*

The Prophets do the ſame Thing. *Iſaiah* ſays of the *Jews*, *c.* lxiii. 10. That *they rebelled and vexed his* (God's) *Holy Spirit.* Which *Holy Spirit*

rit is the ſame with *the Angel of his Preſence*, that conducted and ſaved them, *v.* 9. For this was *the Being* that was provoked by them in the Wilderneſs, and in the ſucceeding Generations. But this *Angel of his Preſence* is *God himſelf* according to the *Septuag.* and according to their Notion of the word *Preſence*, Exod. xxxiii. that is, it is God himſelf as manifeſted in the Glory. It appears then that the Prophet looked upon God as manifeſted in the Glory, and the Holy Ghoſt to be *One*.

Ver. 11. He ſays, *where is He that put his Holy Spirit in the midſt of Him?* Now that which was in the midſt of them was *the Glory of the Lord*, ſometimes reſting on his Tabernacle in the midſt of the Camp; and ſometimes marching before them in the Cloud, *Exod.* xl. 34, &c. *Numb.* ii. 17. Which *Glory* is called by the Name of *God*; and is ſaid to be *Jehovah himſelf*, Zech. ii. 5. *I, ſaith Jehovah,——— will be the Glory in the midſt of Her.*

Ver. 14. *He* ſays, *the Spirit of the Lord cauſed Him to reſt.* But it was the *Glory*, or his *Preſence*, that led, conducted them, and cauſed them to reſt in the Land of *Canaan*. It is plain then that the *Glory* and *Spirit* were conſidered as one in the Eye of the Prophet. But the Glory is called Jehovah; the Spirit therefore, who is one with it, is comprehended in Jehovah; which being but *One*, *Deut.* vi. 4. and the Name incommunicable, *Exod.* iii. 15. *Pſal.* lxxxiii. 18. God and the Spirit, who are Jehovah, are *One*; that is, as the Divine Nature or Jehovah is but one; ſo is the Glory, which is a Manifeſtation of it, and called by the ſame Name, but *One* alſo; but this *One* Glory is that of God and the Spirit, therefore it may reaſonably be inferred, That God and the Spirit are united in the *One* Divine Nature, as they are in the Glory or Manifeſtation of it.

Ezekiel ſeems to be of the ſame Mind with *Iſaiah*; for ſays He, *c.* viii. *v.* 2, 3. *I beheld, and lo, a likeneſs as the appearance of fire:* —— *And He put forth the form of an hand, and took*

took me by a lock of mine head; and the Spirit lift me up. It is no wonder that the Spirit lift up the Prophet, when the *Hand* of the Glory or of the Lord (for ſo it is called *c.* ix. *v.* 3, 4.) took him by a Lock of the Head, for indeed the Spirit is called the *Hand* of the Lord *v.* 1. and *c.* iii. *v.* 14. *The Spirit lifted me up, and took me away—— The hand of the Lord was ſtrong upon me.* That is, the Spirit, which took him up, was ſtrong upon Him; (or the Spirit of Prophecy, as the *Hand* is called, Paraph. Chald.) As then the *Hand* is *one* with the viſible Glory of the Lord, ſo may it reaſonably be concluded that the Spirit is *One* with Jehovah or the Lord manifeſted in it.

Note, *the Spirit* and the *Son* are called the Hands of *God* the Father by *Irenæus*, Lib. 5. c. 6. and Lib. 1. *in præf.* and are ſaid to be *God himſelf.* Lib. 2. c. 55. *p.* 185.

Chap. iii. v. 24. *The Spirit entered into me, and ſet me upon my Feet, and ſpake with me.* No Subject intervenes between *Spirit* and *Spake*; ſo that the Spirit, which ſet him upon his Feet, ſeems to have ſpoken to him. If then this be true, the Spirit calls himſelf, *Lord Jehovah*, v. 27. *When I ſpeak with thee, I will open thy mouth, and thou ſhalt ſay unto them, Thus ſaith the Lord Jehovah.* And doubtleſs the Teſtimony of the Spirit concerning himſelf, is to be believed by us. It is true, indeed, That the Verbs *entered* and *ſet* are Feminine, relating to Spirit; but *Spake* a Maſculine; and therefore may belong to Glory, and not Spirit. But ſince Verbs of both Genders are joyned with Spirit, (ſee *Gen.* vi. 3. 1 *Kings* viii. 12.) I think it is moſt agreeable to the Conſtruction, to refer them all to Spirit.

Chap. xi. V. 1, 2. *Moreover the Spirit lift me up, and brought me unto the Eaſt-gate of the Lord's Houſe,— Then ſaid He unto me.* Here the Spirit is the common Subject of the Verbs according to the foregoing Obſervation.

ſervation. The *Septuag.* and *Syriack* indeed, put in *Lord* before the Verb *ſaid, and the Lord ſaid unto me.* But whether they refer it to the Glory at the Eaſt-gate, *c.* x. 19. whither the Prophet was carried, *c.* xi. 1. or to the Spirit carrying him, as being one with the Glory, is uncertain; though the latter is more probable according to the *Hebrew*, which has no Subject beſide *Spirit* only.

Ver. 5. *And the Spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and ſaid unto me.* The *Spirit* again is the common Subject *of both* theſe Verbs, which have the ſame Diſtinction of Maſculine and Feminine with the former. If then the *Spirit* is the Perſon ſpeaking, and calls himſelf *Lord* or *Jehovah*, as he does, *v.* 10, 12. *Ye ſhall know that I am the Lord*, He is truly ſuch. And if it be objected that the Spirit ſpeaks in *the Name of the Lord* only, and not in his own Name, becauſe He ſays to the Prophet, *viz. ſpeak, thus ſaith the Lord*; it may be anſwered, That where the Lord himſelf undoubtedly ſpeaks; the like Form of Words is uſed, as *Iſai.* vii. 3, 4, 7. *Then ſaid the Lord unto Iſaiah, Go*

Go forth now to meet Ahaz,———and say unto him,———thus saith the Lord God.

After the same manner, because the *One* Glory of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, was manifested in the Human Nature of Christ, though the Word Only was Personally united to it, are the Words of Christ attributed to the Spirit. *Revel.* ii. and iii.

It is no wonder then from all these Considerations, That some Antient Writers understood, *Isai.* vi. 9, *&c.* as cited by St. *John* and St. *Paul*, to be expressive of the Trinity in Unity of Essence and Glory.

Chrysostom says upon the Words of St. *John*, c. xii. 41.

Ταῦτα δὲ εἶπεν, ὅτε εἶδεν αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν· τίνος; τοῦ Πατρός· πῶς οὖν ὁ Ἰωάννης περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγει, ὁ δὲ Παῦλος περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος; οὐχ ὡς συναλείφοντες τοὺς

These things said Isaiah when He saw his Glory, Whose Glory? The Father's. How then does *John* apply them to the Son, and *Paul* to the Spirit? Not as confounding the Persons, but declaring

claring the Glory to be but one.

ὑποστάσεις, ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀξίαν δηλοῦντες εἶναι, φάσι. In loc.

Jerom says, who that Lord was, who was seen, may be fully learnt from *John* the *Evangelist*, and the Acts of the Apostles. *John* —— evidently means Christ. *Paul* in the Acts——says, *well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaias*——But the Son was *seen* in the Dress of a King. And the Holy Ghost *spake* as being a Partner in the Glory, and one with Him in Substance.

Quis sit autem iste Dominus qui videtur, in Evangelistâ Johanne & in Apostolorum actis plenius discimus. Quorum Joannes—— haud dubium quin Christum significet. Rursum Paulus in actis—— bene, inquit, Spiritus Sanctus locutus est per Isaiam, —— visus est autem Filius in regnantis habitu. Et locutus est Spiritus Sanctus propter consortium majestatis, unitatemq; substantiæ; In Isai. vi. 1.

And indeed the Glory speaks of it self as Plural as well as Singular, when it says, *Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?* Isai. vi.

MLXXV. John iii. 5. *Except a Man be born—— * of the Spirit, He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

* To be born *of the Spirit*, is according to this Evangeliſt, *c.* i. 23. to be born *of God*; it is probable then that *God* and the *Spirit* or Holy Ghoſt were believed by Him to be *One*.

Nemeſianus a Thubunis was of this Opinion, who reaſons thus,

Quod natum eſt de carne, caro eſt; & quod natum eſt de Spiritu, Spiritus eſt; quia Deus Spiritus eſt, & de Deo natus eſt. Concil. Carthag. apud Cyp. §. 5.

That which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. For *God* is the Spirit, and it is born of God.

That is, That which is born of the Spirit, is therefore Spirit, becauſe it is born of *God*, who is the Spirit.

MCXXI. Matt.

MCXXI. Matt. xii. 31, 32. *The blaſphemy againſt* the Holy Ghoſt *ſhall not be forgiven unto Men. And whoſoever ſpeaketh a word againſt the Son of Man, it ſhall be forgiven him; but whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the* Holy Ghoſt, *it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.*

The Dr. argues, That the Blaſphemy is not againſt the *Perſon*, but the *Works* of the Holy Ghoſt, for this Reaſon, becauſe otherwiſe Blaſphemy againſt the Perſons of God the Father, and the Son of God, would be as unpardonable as that againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Which is plainly ſuppoſing, That Blaſphemy againſt God the Father, and the Son of God are pardonable. But where this Doctrine is to be found is hard to tell; the Text does not ſeem to infer it, nor the Parallel places in the reſt of the Evangeliſts. Nay, the Scripture rather contradicts it. For, *Firſt*,

Blaſphemy

Blaſphemy againſt *the Father* is unpardonable according to *Levit.* xxiv. 11, 13, 16. as interpreted by the *Jews*. The Words are theſe, *an Iſraelitiſh Woman's Son blaſphemed*, or profanely uttered, *the Name.*——*And the Lord ſpake unto Moſes, ſaying*——*He that blaſphemeth the Name of the Lord*, or the Name Jehovah, *He ſhall ſurely be put to Death, and all the Congregation ſhall certainly ſtone him.* Now doubtleſs, Blaſphemy againſt the *Name* of God the Father, is Blaſphemy againſt *God the Father himſelf*; if then Blaſphemy againſt the *Name*, is not to be pardoned but puniſhed with Death, Blaſphemy againſt *the Perſon* is equally unpardonable. And becauſe it may be objected, that this only proves it unpardonable in *this World*, but not in the *World to come*: That the Temporal Puniſhment was to be inflicted, but not that the Sin was irremiſſible; I ſhall obſerve that the *Jewiſh* Doctors were of another Mind. They had a Tradition among them, that there were certain Crimes, that excluded the Sinners from having any Portion in * *the World to come.* Among which

לעולם הבא

was

was pronouncing the Name *Jehovah*, according to its Letters (*a*); Now they looked upon the *Egyptian* to have curſed God, by ſuch a Pronounciation of the Sacred Name (*b*). The Conſequence of which is, That his Blaſphemy was irremiſſible *in the World to come*. Whether then the Reaſon aſſigned by them be good or no for their judging it unpardonable; this is certain, they had ſuch a Doctrine, that there were ſome Crimes, that were not to be pardon'd in *the World to come*; and if any Crime, Blaſphemy doubtleſs againſt the God of Heaven, or the Perſon of the Father, as being an Act of open Defiance and moſt provoking Inſolence. And to this *Jewiſh* Doctrine, it is probable our Saviour has reſpect in ſpeaking of the Sin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*; and St. *Paul* alſo in pronouncing Apoſtacy from Chriſt, to be beyond Repentance (*a*), to have no Sacrifice that is capable of expiating it (*b*), to be reſerved for the Judgment, and Fire of the Great Day (*c*), and by Conſequence to be unpardonable in the World to come. And St. *John* alſo in affirming, That there

(*a*) Tract. de Syned. c. 11. §. 1. Vol 4. Leg. Miſc.
(*b*) Ibid. in not. ad c. 7. §. 5. p. 242.

(*a*) Heb. vi. 6.
(*b*) Ch. x. 26.
(*c*) Ch. vi. 8, & 10, 27.

is *a Sin unto Death*, that is, not to be pray'd for in order to be pardoned (*d*).

(d) 1 Joh. v. 16.

St. *Cyprian* ſeems to be of the mind, that there were Sins againſt *God*, that were alike unpardonable with that againſt the Spirit; for when he had cited *Matthew* and *Mark* for the unpardonable Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, He adds,

De hoc ipſo in Baſileiwn primo: Si delinquendo peccet Vir adverſus Virum, orabunt pro eo Dominum: Si autem in Deum peccet homo, Quis orabit pro eo? Teſtim. Lib. 3. c. 28.

Concerning this very thing (or Sin) it is written in the Firſt of *Kings* (or 1 *Sam.* ii. 25.) *If one man ſin againſt another, they ſhall intreat the Lord for him: But if a man ſin againſt God*, (or Jehovah) *who ſhall intreat for him?*

Now *God* or *Jehovah* is He, whoſe Service and Tabernacle were polluted and prophaned by the Sons of *Eli*: If then *Cyprian* by *God* underſtood the *Spirit*, then He believed the *Spirit* to be *God*. But if He meant the *Father*, then the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt

Ghoſt was not the only One, which He believed unpardonable.

Secondly, Blaſphemy againſt the Son, as He is Son of God, and God himſelf, is unpardonable alſo. For if the Son as Son of God, and God is *Jehovah*, as Scripture and Antiquity affirms; and if Blaſphemy againſt the Name *Jehovah* is unpardonable; Blaſphemy againſt the Son of God is unpardonable alſo. Neither does this contradict the Text, which ſays, *Whoſoever ſpeaks a Word againſt the Son of Man, it ſhall be forgiven him.* For Jeſus Chriſt as He is *Son of Man*, is not *Son of God* or Jehovah; and therefore Blaſphemy againſt Him *as Son of Man*, is not Blaſphemy againſt the Name Jehovah, or the Son of God; and therefore is it remiſſible, as being done, not againſt the Godhead, but the Humanity of the Son, which is a meer Creature. For in this reſpect, it is of the order of Crimes, which one Man is ſaid to commit againſt another, and admits of Interceſſion in order to be pardoned.

Since then Blaſphemy againſt the Father, and the Son as God, is unpardonable, it can be no Argument that the unpardonable Sin of Blaſphemy was not againſt the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe there is no ſuch unpardonable Sin againſt the Perſon of the Father and of the Son of God; but on the contrary, becauſe there is ſuch an unpardonable Sin againſt the Perſon of the Father, and of the Son of God as God, both comprehended in the Name of Jehovah; it may be inferred, that the unpardonable Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt was not Blaſphemy againſt his Works only, but his Perſon alſo. For when they ſaid, *He* (Chriſt) *had Beelzebub*, or *an unclean Spirit*, they reſolved the Works into a Diabolical Principle, or took occaſion from the Works to traduce the Perſon and Authority that wrought them, making him *unclean* who was truly *Holy*; and of a *deviliſh* Nature, who was really *Divine*; which appears to be as Perſonal an Injury, as any that cou'd be offered.

It is further obſerved in the Comment as a remarkable thing, "That "neither here in St. *Matthew*, nei- "ther in any other Place of Scrip- "ture, is there any mention made of "any Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, but "only of a *Blaſphemy* againſt the Ho- "ly Ghoſt." What does the Remarker think of the *lying* to, and tempting the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* v. 3. 9. Was not that a Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt? And a Sin of a different Sort from that of Blaſphemy? And a Sin, not againſt *the Works*, for as *Ananias* and *Sapphira* did not blaſpheme them, ſo how cou'd they lie to, and tempt *Works*? But a Sin againſt the Authority and Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, that was preſent with the Apoſtles and acted thro' them; as it might well do, being preſent every where, (*a*) and filling the World, and containing all things, *Wiſd.* i. 7.

(*a*) Pſal. cxxxix. 7, 8.

MCXXXII. 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18. *The Lord is that Spirit*, and where *the Spirit of the Lord* is, there is *Liberty*.

But we all with open Face, beholding as in a Glaſs the Glory of the Lord, are changed into the ſame Image, from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

The Comment explains theſe words, *The Lord is that Spirit*, thus "Chriſt "(or the Goſpel of Chriſt) is the true "Intent and Spirit (in oppoſition to "the dead Letter and burdenſome "Rites) of the Law." But I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, that there is ſomething more literal contained in them, and expreſſive of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt. In order to which two Things ſhall be conſidered, 1*ſt*, who the *Lord* is; 2*dly*, who the *Spirit*. Who *the Lord* is, will appear by comparing *v.* 16. with *Exod.* xxxiv. 34. The words of both places are theſe. *Nevertheleſs when it* (the Heart) *ſhall turn to the Lord, the Vail ſhall be taken away*, v. 16.

When Moſes went in before the Lord (Jehovah)——— *He took the Vail off.* Exod. xxxiv. 34.

Here is a plain Alluſion of the former Words to the latter, importing that

that as the Vail was taken from the Face of *Moſes*, when He went into the Tabernacle to talk with the Lord (Jehovah;) ſo the Vail ſhou'd be remov'd from the *Heart* of the unbelieving *Jews*, when it ſhould turn or move towards the Lord (or Jehovah;) for ſo the term *Lord* ſeems to mean; it being difficult to ſuppoſe that the *Being*, before whom the real Vail is removed, ſhould not be Jehovah, when He, before whom the typical one was taken away, is really ſuch. Now this very *Lord* or Jehovah, before whom the inward Vail is taken away, is ſaid to be the Spirit, *v.* 17. *The Lord is the Spirit.* The *Lord* then is Jehovah.

The ſecond Conſideration is, who *the Spirit* is; which will appear to be the *Holy Ghoſt* by looking back upon the Context. For the Apoſtle makes an Oppoſition between the Law and the Goſpel, ſhewing that the firſt was a Diſpenſation of Condemnation, as having no Sacrifice for Sin, nor quickening Spirit; the latter a Diſpenſation of Juſtification, as having both; and tells the *Corinthians v.* 3. that the Goſpel

was written in their Hearts by *the Spirit of the Living God*, or, the Holy Ghoſt, in Oppoſition to the Law written upon Tables of Stone; That the Apoſtles were *Miniſters of the Spirit*, *v.* 6. which was the peculiar Gift of the new Covenant, adminiſtred to the Faithful by the Impoſition of their Hands; And that Divine Life was given to the Church by the *quickening Spirit*, and that the *Spirit thus adminiſtred* was the Spirit of Glory, *v.* 8. as *Peter* calls it, *c.* iv. 14; that is, ſuch a Spirit, as will adorn Believers in the Life to come with a brighter and more laſting Glory, than that which diſcovered it ſelf in the Face of *Moſes*. The *Spirit* then being uſed for the *Holy Ghoſt*, or *the Spirit of the Living God*, in the preceding part of the Chapter, it is no wonder that the Apoſtle repeats it in the ſame ſenſe, *v.* 17. ſaying, *now the Lord*, or Jehovah, *is that Spirit*, that is, is the Spirit of which He had been ſpeaking; for nothing occurs in the whole Context to determine it to another Senſe; nay the remaining part of the Verſe rather confirms it, *where the Spirit of the Lord*

is,

is, (that is, *the Holy Ghoſt*, which ſeems ever to be underſtood by *the Spirit of the Lord*) *there is Liberty*. Whence it may be obſerved, that as *the Spirit* it ſelf *is Lord* or Jehovah; ſo is it ſaid to be the *Spirit of the Lord* or of Jehovah; that is as it is the Spirit of the Father, it is the Spirit of Jehovah; and as it is ſubſtantially one with the Father, it is it ſelf Jehovah. For *Jehovah* is but *One*, *Deut.* vi. 4. in the laſt Verſe it is called again, *the Lord* (or Jehovah) *the Spirit* (*even as by the Lord the Spirit*, *v.* 18.) which is the more agreeable rendring on the following Conſiderations, *1ſt*, becauſe the Poſitions of the Words are the ſame with, *the Lord is that Spirit*, *v.* 17. *2dly*, Becauſe according to the Apoſtles way of writing, He would probably have put Πνεῦμα before Κύριος in this oblique Conſtruction of the Nouns, had his Meaning been, *the Spirit of the Lord*. Theſe two Verſes then are a ſtrong Teſtimony for the Divinity of the Spirit, or that the *Holy Ghoſt is God*.

MCCXI. Matt. xxviii. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of—— the Holy Ghoſt.*

A Teſtimony of *Tertullian* for the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt muſt not be omitted in this place.

Spiritus Dei ſuper aquas ferebatur—— ſolus Liquor—— dignum vectaculum Deo ſubjiciebat. De Bapt. c. 3. p. 159. Edit. De la Cerda.

The Spirit of God, ſays He, moved upon the Waters——— That liquid Element only—— afforded a Chariot worthy *of God*, (that is, of *the Spirit* moving upon it.)

Note, This was written before he was a Montaniſt.

Clemens Alexandrinus is more plain:

Non hic Hominis ſed Columbæ ſimilitudinem Deus aſſumpſit, quia volebat novâ quâdam apparitione Spiritus,

God did not take upon Him the Likeneſs of a Man, but of *a Dove*. Becauſe the *Spirit* wou'd, by a new ſort of Appearance in the Likeneſs of *a Dove*, declare

declare his Simplicity and Meekneſs.

per Columbæ ſimilitudinem, ſimplicitatem ac manſuetudinem declarare. Ex Cat. in S. Luc. ad fin. Lib. *Quis Dives*, &c.

MCCXLVIII. 1 John v. 7. *For there are three that bear Record in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe three are* One.

Since it ought not to be concealed, That this Paſſage does not certainly appear to have been found in the Text of any Greek Manuſcript: It ought alſo to be told, That it appears to have been found in the old *Latin* Verſion, that was uſed in the *African* Church. Elſe how cou'd St. *Cyprian* have cited it in his Treatiſe, *De Unit. Eccleſ.*?

And again, it is *written* of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; *And theſe three are One.*

Et iterum De Patre, & Filio, & Spiritu Sancto ſcriptum eſt; & Hi tres unum ſunt.

Now

Now where is this *written*, but in the abovecited Paſſage of St. *John*?

Again in his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, He ſays,

Si peccatorum remiſſam conſecutus eſt, & ſanctificatus eſt, & Templum Dei factus eſt; Quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit Qui in eum non credidit: Si Chriſti, nec hujus fieri poteſt Templum, qui negat Deum Chriſtum. Si Spiritûs Sancti, cum tres unum ſint, &c.

If a Man can obtain Remiſſion of Sins, (among Hereticks,) then is He ſanctified, and made the Temple of God. But of what God, I beſeech you? If of the *Creator*, that is impoſſible, becauſe He has not believed in him: If of *Chriſt*, neither can He be his Temple, becauſe He denies Chriſt to be God. If of the *Holy Ghoſt*, foraſmuch as theſe *three are One*, &c.

Here is a plain Alluſion to the ſame Paſſage of St. *John*'s Epiſtle; beſides a Teſtimony of the Author's Opinion of the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; ſince under the Term *God* He comprehends the *Creator*, *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*.

As

As for *the Unity of theſe Three*, it is not a bare Unity of Teſtimony, but of *Subſtance*. (See N° 594.) *Tertullian* ſays of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

Which Three are One (*Being*,) *not one* (ſingle Perſon;) as it is ſaid, *I and my Father are One* (Being,) to expreſs the Unity of Subſtance, not the Singularity of Perſon.

Qui tres unum ſunt, *non unus: Quomodo dictum eſt*, Ego & Pater unum ſumus, *ad ſubſtantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri ſingularitatem.* Cont. Prax. c. 25.

In which Words, as *Tertullian* ſeems plainly to have read the ſame Paſſage with St. *Cyprian* in St. *John*'s Epiſtle, *Theſe Three are One*; ſo have we no Reaſon to believe, but that his Diſciple *Cyprian* followed his Maſter in underſtanding *One* of a Subſtantial Unity.

FINIS.

BOOKS printed for, and ſold by Richard Smith, *at Biſhop* Beveridge's *Head in* Pater-Noſter-Row; *where Gentlemen may be furniſh'd with all Modern Books, and Money for any Library or Parcel of Books.*

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

GEorgii Bull S. Theologiæ Profeſſoris & Presbyteri Anglicani, Opera omnia, quibus duo præcipui Catholicæ fidei Articuli, de S. Trinitate & Juſtificatione, orthodoxè, perſpicuè, ac ſolidè, explanantur, illuſtrantur, confirmantur; nunc demum in unum Volumen collecta, ac multo correctiùs quàm antè, unà cum generalibus Indicibus Edita. Quibus jam acceſſit ejuſdem Tractatus hactenus ineditus, de Primitiva & Apoſtolica Traditione dogmatis de Jeſu Chriſti Divinitate contra Danielem Zuickerum, ejuſque nuperos in Anglia Sectatores; ſubnexa inſuper pluribus ſingulorum Librorum capitibus prolixa quandoque annotata Joannis Erneſti Grabe, cujus etiam Præfatio huic Volumini eſt præmiſſa.

Septuaginta Interpretum quem ex antiquiſſimo MS. codice Alexandrino accuratè deſcriptum. Et ope aliorum exemplarium, ac priſcorum Scriptorum, præſertim vero Hexaplaris Editionis Origenianæ emendatum atque ſupplementum, additis ſæpe Aſteriſcorum & Obelorum ſignis, ſumma cura edidit Joannes Erneſtus Grabe, *S. T. P.* Fol. & Octavo.

The Hereditary Right of the Crown of *England*

land aſſerted; the Hiſtory of the Succeſſion ſince the Conqueſt clear'd; and the true *Engliſh* Conſtitution vindicated from the Miſrepreſentations of Dr. *Higden*'s *View* and *Defence*.

An Expoſition of the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*. By Biſhop *Beveridge*.

OCTAVO and *DUODECIMO*.

PRivate Thoughts on Religion, digeſted into Twelve Articles; with Practical Reſolutions form'd thereupon: Written in his younger Years, for the ſettling of his Principles, and the Conduct of his Life. The Seventh Edition, illuſtrated and adorn'd with Sculptures.

Private Thoughts upon a Chriſtian Life; or neceſſary Directions for its Beginning and Progreſs upon Earth, in order to its final Perfection in the Beatifick Viſion. Part II. Written in his riper Years, and printed from his Original Manuſcripts. The Third Edition, illuſtrated and adorn'd with Sculptures.

The great Neceſſity and Advantage of Publick Prayer, and frequent Communion. Deſign'd to revive Primitive Piety. With Meditations, Ejaculations, and Prayers, before, at, and after the Sacrament. The Fourth Edition; to be had both in a large and ſmall Character.

One hundred and Twenty eight Sermons, and other Diſcourſes, on ſeveral Subjects, 10 Vol. *viz.*

Vol. I. Chriſt's Preſence with his Miniſters in general. The Manner of Ordination in the Church of *England*. Salvation in the Church only under ſuch a Miniſtry. The true Notion of religious Worſhip. A Form of Sound Words to be uſed by Miniſters. The Church

eſtabliſh'd

eſtabliſhed on a Rock. Chriſtianity an Holy Prieſthood. The preparatory Duties for Holy Orders. The Efficacy of Faith in the Miniſtration of the Word. Miniſters the Ambaſſadors of Chriſt. The Sacerdotal Benediction in the Name of the Trinity, explained.

Vol. II. The Being and Attributes of God. The Love of God in Man's Salvation. The Merits of Chriſt's Paſſion. Salvation thro' Fear and Trembling. The Conſcience void of Offence. The Knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt preferable to all other. The new Creature in Chriſtianity. The Nature and Eternity of Heaven's Joys and Hell's Torment. The Glories of Chriſt's Croſs. The Excellency of the Soul above worldly Goods. A Spiritual Life the Characteriſtick of a Chriſtian. The Obligation of Superiors to promote Religion.

Vol. III. The Unity of Chriſt with God the Father. The Incarnation of Chriſt. Chriſt the only Saviour. Chriſt the ſole Author of Grace and Truth. Chriſt the Saviour of all that come to him. Chriſt the only Mediator. All things to be asked in the Name of Chriſt. Chriſt, as Man, is the Head over all things. Chriſt is our Lord and Maſter. The Bleſſed Eſtate of thoſe who believe in Chriſt. Admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt by Baptiſm, neceſſary to Salvation. Coming to Chriſt the only Means of Salvation. Abiding in Chriſt the only Means of univerſal Happineſs. Bearing much Fruit, the Characteriſtick of Chriſt's Diſciples.

Vol. IV. The Uſefulneſs of Faſting. The Sufficiency of Grace. Faith the Governing Principle of a Chriſtian Life. Faith in God and

Chriſt

Chriſt a Sovereign Remedy againſt all Troubles. Faith the Principle of Love and Joy. Chriſt the Foundation of all the Promiſes. God our Sovereign Good. The preſent Security and future Happineſs of the Saints. The Communion of the Saints. The Chriſtian Prize. The New Creation. Stedfaſtneſs to the eſtabliſh'd Church recommended.

Vol. V. The One Thing needful. Univerſal Obedience requiſite to Salvation. The Glory of God the final Cauſe of all things. God alone to be ſerv'd. The Advantages of Publick Worſhip. The Duty of Publick Thankſgiving. The Sufficiency of Scripture. The Preference of Spiritual Food to Natural. The Preference of Things inviſible and eternal to viſible and temporal. Of Truſt in God. The Nature and Neceſſity of Reſtitution.

Vol. VI. Three Sermons on *Good-Friday*. The Myſtery of our Reconciliation by *Chriſt* explain'd. The Satisfaction of *Chriſt*, explain'd. An *Eaſter* Sermon. *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection a Proof of his Divinity. *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection a Proof of ours. *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection the Cauſe of our Regeneration. *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection the Cauſe of our Juſtification. *Chriſt*'s Reſurrection an Object of great Joy. An *Eaſter* Sermon. *Chriſt*'s Aſcenſion into Heaven preparatory to ours. A *Whitſon* Sermon.

Vol. VII. The Danger of Unbelief. Faith the principal inward Purity. Faith in *Chriſt* the only Means of Overcoming the World. Faith in *Chriſt* our Title to the Privilege of Sonſhip. The Profeſſion of our Faith in *Chriſt* ought to be publick. The Profeſſion of our Faith in *Chriſt* ought to be conſtant. Repentance the End of *Chriſt*'s Coming

Coming into the World. Repentance a certain and the only Method of obtaining Pardon. Repentance the only Method of eſcaping Temporal Judgments, preach'd on the Anniverſary Faſt for the Fire of *London*. Repentance the only Method of eſcaping eternal Judgments. Repentance and Faith the two great Branches of the Evangelical Covenant.

Vol. VIII. Holineſs the great Deſign of the Goſpel Diſpenſation. *Chriſt*'s Life a Pattern of Holineſs to Chriſtians. The Holineſs of Chriſtians tought to be conſpicuous. The Wiſdom of being Holy. The Pleaſure of being Holy. The Advantages of being Holy. The exemplary Holineſs of he Primitive Chriſtians. *Chriſt*'s Grace ſufficient to make Chriſtians holy.

Vol. IX. The Nature, Extent, and Polity of God's Kingdom on Earth. God's Omnipreſence the beſt Guard againſt Sin. Perpetual Rejoycing the Duty of *Chriſtians*. Univerſal Thankſgiving the Duty of *Chriſtians*. All things to be done to the Glory of God. All things to be done in the Name of Chriſt. The Meditation of God's Law the good Man's Delight. The Vanity of hearing the Word of God without doing it. The Duty and Advantage of ſeeking things ſpiritual. The Sinfulneſs & Miſchief of worldly Anxiety. The great Duty of loving God. The great Happineſs of loving God.

Vol. X. The Eaſineſs of Chriſt's Yoke. The Chriſtian Race. Chriſt the Way, the Truth and the Life. Chriſt a Saviour before his Incarnation. The Preſence of Chriſt in the Religious Aſſembly of Chriſtians. The Way of ſeeking God ſo as to find him. The Way of pleaſing God. The Parable of the Sower. The Bleſſing of Purity in Heart. Againſt raſh Swearing. A *Spittal* Sermon. Obedience to Governours.

N. B. In a ſhort time will be publiſh'd two more Volumes of Sermons, with an *Index* to the Whole, and the *Characters* by ſeveral Eminent Men.

Theſaurus Theologicus; or a complete Syſtem of Divinity, ſumm'd up in brief Notes upon ſelect Places of the Old and New Teſtament; wherein the ſacred Text is reduced under proper Heads, explained and illuſtrated with the Opinions and Authorities of the Ancient Fathers, Councils, *&c.* in 4 Volumes, *Octavo.*

All theſe by the Right Reverend Father in God William Beveridge, *D. D. late Lord Biſhop of* St. Aſaph.

The Doctrine of the Two Covenants; the Doctrine of the Two Sacraments; and Death diſarm'd of its Sting. In 3 Vols. *Octavo.* By the Right Reverend Father in God *Ezekiel Hopkins*, D. D. late Lord Biſhop of *Londonderry.* Now firſt publiſhed from his Original Manuſcripts.

Some important Points of Primitive Chriſtianity maintained and defended; in ſeveral Sermons, and other Diſcourſes. By *George Bull*, D.D. late Lord Biſhop of *St. David's*, Viz.

Vol. I. The Neceſſity of Works of Righteouſneſs, in order to Salvation; tho' the Reward of them is only to be expected from the Free Grace and Mercy of God, aſſerted againſt the *Antinomians* and *Papiſts.* That the Soul of Man ſubſiſts after Death in a place of abode provided by God for it, till the Reſurrection; concerning the middle State of Happineſs or Miſery, allotted by God to every Man preſently after Death, according as he has been good or bad in his paſt Life, inconſiſtent with the Popiſh Doctrine of *Purgatory.* The low and mean Condition of the Bleſſed Virgin conſidered; as alſo the ſingular Grace and Favour of God vouchſafed to her; and that Reſpect which is due to her from us upon that Ac-

count, wherein the Invocation of her by the *Papiſts* is refuted. St. *Paul's* Thorn in the Fleſh, the Meſſenger of Satan, ſent to prevent his being exalted above meaſure, conſider'd and explain'd; with ſeveral Practical Obſervations drawn from that Subject. A Viſitation Sermon concerning the great Difficulty and Danger of the Prieſtly Office. The different Degrees of Bliſs and Glory in Chriſt's heavenly Kingdon, anſwer to the different Degrees of Grace here below. Several Objections againſt this Doctrine are anſwered. Everlaſting Life hoped for by good Men, under the Old Teſtament; and that the Conſideration of the Vanity of the preſent Life, is an effectual Means to make us fix our Minds upon Things eternal. What that Worthineſs is, and wherein it conſiſts, which is required of thoſe that ſhall be Partakers of the future heavenly Glory.

Vol. II. That the Poverty of the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel was deſign'd by Providence to convince the World of their Sincerity; and that even Perſons divinely inſpired, and Miniſters of God, did not ſo wholly depend on divine Inſpiration, but that they made uſe alſo of the ordinary Help and Means, ſuch as Reading of Books, with Study and Meditation on them, for their Aſſiſtance in the Diſcharge of their Office. The Exiſtence of Angels proved from Reaſon as well as Scripture; their Creation by God; the Fall of ſome of them; the Nature of the Holy Angels; their State and Condition in reference to God. The Office of the Holy Angels in reference to good Men; being appointed by God as the Miniſters of his ſpecial Providence towards the Faithful; and wherein the Angelical Miniſtry doth more eſpecially conſiſt. Preſcrib'd Forms of Prayer in the publick Worſhip of God, practiſed from the very beginning of Chriſtianity, and was not only ancient, but uſeful and neceſſary upon many Accounts. That the Doctrine

of

of the Recompence of Reward to be beſtow'd on the Righteous after this Life, was underſtood and believed by the People of God before the Law was given; and that it is lawful to ſerve God with reſpect to, or in hope of, the future, heavenly Recompence. That many may have a Form or Shew of Godlineſs, when they deny its Power, and are far from the Reality and Truth of it. A proſperous Condition in this World is a Bleſſing of God, wherein we not only may, but ought to rejoice, ſince it is given us by God as a peculiar Time of Comfort and Rejoicing. Adverſity the proper Seaſon of ſerious Conſideration, and ſo contrived by the Providence of God, that it ſhould be intermixt with Proſperity; and this Mixture of Good and Evil ſo proportioned by the ſame Providence, that it obviates all Diſcontent and Murmuring againſt God. That it is a very ſinful and vain thing for any Man ſo to glory in his own Wiſdom, Strength or Wealth, as to place his Truſt and Confidence in either or all of them. That the religious Acknowledgment of God's Providence, in the wiſe and righteous Government and Diſpoſal of all humane Affairs, joyn'd with an humble Dependance and firm Truſt in him, in the Way of Obedience, to Him, Man's beſt, and, indeed, only Security.

Vol. III, That it is a Matter of great Uſe and Concernment, much conducing to the Purpoſes of Religion, ſeriouſly to conſider the Shortneſs and Uncertainty of Life; and that ſuch due Conſideration of our ſhort and uncertain Abode in this World, is the Gift of God, and the Effect of his Grace, which therefore ought to be ſought for by humble and earneſt Prayer. *Diſcourſe* 1. The Doctrine of the Catholick Church for the firſt three Ages of Chriſtianity, concerning the Bleſſed Trinity, conſider'd; in Oppoſition to *Sabellianiſm* and *Tritheiſm*. *Diſc.* 2. The principal Parts and Branches of the Paſtoral Office

with Rules and Directions for the due Performance of each of them. *Disc.* 3. Concerning the Spirit of God in the Faithful, how and in what manner it doth bear Witneſs with their Spirits, that they are the Children of God; and what Degree of Hope or Perſuaſion concerning their Adoption, this Witneſs of the Spirit doth ordinarily produce in the Faithful. *Disc.* 4. The Conſubſtantiality and Co-eternity of the Son of God with the Father, aſſerted; or, ſome few Animadverſions on a Treatiſe of Mr. *Gilbert Clerke*, entituled, *Antenicenisſmus*, ſo far as the Author pretends to anſwer Dr. *George Bull's Defence of the* Nicene *Faith*. *Disc.* 5. Concerning the firſt Covenant, and the State of Man before the Fall; according to the Scripture, and the Senſe of the Primitive Doctors of the Catholick Church. The Life of Dr. *George Bull*, late Lord Biſhop of *St. David's*: With the Hiſtory of thoſe Controverſies in which he was engaged. And an Abſtract of thoſe Fundamental Doctrines which he maintain'd and defended in the *Latin* Tongue. By *Robert Nelſon*, Eſq; *Octavo*.

N. B. There are ſome Printed upon large Royal Paper, for thoſe who are Curious.

The Theory of Sciences illuſtrated; or the Grounds and Principles of the Seven Liberal Arts, Grammar, Logick, Rhetorick, Muſick, Arithmetick, Geometry, Aſtronomy, accurately demonſtrated and reduced to Practice. With Variety of Queſtions, Problems and Propoſitions both delightful and profitable. By *H. Curſon*, Gent.

An Epiſtolary Diſcourſe, proving from the Scriptures and the firſt Fathers, that the Soul is a Principle naturally mortal; but immortalized actually, by the Pleaſure of God, to Puniſhment or to Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptiſmal Spirit: Wherein is proved, that none have the Power of giving this Divine, Immortalizing

lizing Spirit, ſince the Apoſtles, but the Biſhops. With an Hypotheſis concerning Sacerdotal Abſolution. The ſecond Edition corrected. By *Henry Dodwell*, A. M.

Occaſional Communion, fundamentally deſtructive of the Diſcipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, and contrary to the Doctrine of the lateſt Scriptures, concerning Church Communion. By *Henry Dodwell*, M. A.

Exercitationes duæ: Prima de Ætate Phalaridis; Secunda de Ætate Pythagoræ Philoſophi. Ab Henrico Dodwello, A. M.

De nupero Schiſmate Anglicano Paræneſis, ad exteros tam reformatos quam etiam Pontificios quà Jura Epiſcoporum vetera, eorundemque à Magiſtratu ſeculari Independentia omnibus aſſerenda commendantur. Ab Henrico Dodwello, A. M. Dublinienſi.

The ancient Religion of the Gentiles, and Cauſes of their Errors conſider'd: The Miſtakes and Failures of the Heathen Prieſts and Wiſe-Men, in their Notions of the Deities, and Matters of Divine Worſhip, are examined; with regard to their being altogether deſtitute of Divine Revelation. With a complete Index. By the Learned and Judicious *Edward* Lord *Herbert* of *Cherbury*.

The Tale of a Tub revers'd, for the univerſal Improvement of Mankind; with a Character of the Author.

The Hiſtory of *Charles* V. Emperor and King of *Spain*, the great Hero of the Houſe of *Auſtria*; Containing the moſt remarkable Occurrences that happen'd in the World for the ſpace of 56 Years, all Nations being in a greater or leſs Meaſure engaged in the Conteſts and Confuſions of thoſe Times; and giving an Account, 1. How the Houſe of *Auſtria* firſt came to the Crown of *Spain*, and whence the preſent Conteſts between the Emperor and King of *France* had their Original.

ginal. 2. Of the Rebellion of the Commons of *Spain*, and the true Cauſes and Succeſs of it. 3. Of the Wars with *France*, and taking that King Priſoner. 4. Of the Sacking of *Rome*. 5. Of the Reformation and Wars which enſued on that Account. 6. Of the Revolutions and Troubles in *Denmark* and *Sweden*, on Account of Religion. 7. Of the Affairs of *England*, and Marriage of King *Philip* and *Mary* Queen of *England*. 8. Of the Wars with the *Turks*. 9. Of the Taking of *Tunis*, and other places on the Coaſt of *Africa*, with the unfortunate Expedition of *Argiers*. 10. Of the Conqueſt of the vaſt Kingdoms of *Peru*, and *Mexico*, in *America*. And laſtly, Of the moſt Heroick Action of that Emperor's Life, his voluntary reſigning up all his vaſt Dominions, and retiring to a Monaſtery. Written in *Spaniſh* by *D. F. Prudentio de Sandoval*, Biſhop of *Pampelona*, and Hiſtoriographer to King *Philip* III. of *Spain*. Made *Engliſh* by Captain *John Stevens*.

Reflexions on our common Failings. Done out of *French* by a Perſon of Honour.

The Parochial Clergyman's Duty; or an earneſt Exhortation to, 1. Such as hold conſtant Communion with the Eſtabliſh'd Church. 2. Such as ſeparate from, or renounce Communion with, the Eſtabliſh'd Church. 3. The Irreligious and Prophane, or ſuch as neglect the Duties of Religion in general, Digeſted from the Works of the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, the preſent Archbiſhop of *York*, Biſhop *Beveridge*, Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Scott*, Mr. *Wall*, &c.

An Abſtract of the moſt curious and excellent Thoughts of Sieur *de Montaigne*'s Eſſays; very uſeful for improving the Mind, and forming the Manners of Men. Done into *Engliſh* from the *French* Original.

A Conference between the Soul and Body, concerning the preſent and future State: Shewing how different the general Practice of Religion now is from that of the firſt Chriſtians, approv'd and recommended to the World, by the Learned Mr. *Dodwell*. The Second Edition. To which are added, Morning and Evening Hymns. By the Right Reverend Dr. *Kenn*, Biſhop of *Bath* and *Wells*.

Joannis Erneſti Grabi Epiſtola ad clariſſimum virum Dminum Joannem Millium, S. T. P. aulæ S. Edmundi apud Oxonienſes Principalem, Eccleſiæ Cantuarienſis Canonicum digniſſimum; quâ oſtenditur, Libri Judicium genuinam LXX. Interpretum verſionem eam eſſe, quam MS. codex Alexandrinus exhibet: Romanam autem Editionem, quod ad dictum Librum, ab illo prorſus diverſam, atque eadem cum Heſyciana eſſe. Subnexa ſunt Tria Nova τῶν ὁ. Editionis Specimina cum variis Annotationibus.

Solon; Or Philoſophy no Defence againſt Love. A Tragi Comedy. With the Mask of *Orpheus* and *Euridice*. Written by Capt, *Martin Bladen*.

A Paraphraſe and Annotations upon all St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles. Done by ſeveral Eminent Men at *Oxford*; Corrected and Improved by the late Reverend and Learned Biſhop *Fell*. The third Edition, with Additions.

Several Diſcourſes, *viz*. Of Covetouſneſs; of Confeſſion; of Watching and Praying; of Chriſtian Liberty; on Chriſt's Nativity; of Purifying the Temple; on the Reſurrection; of the Poſſibility of Keeping God's Laws; of Feaſting; of Moderation; of Superſtition; on the Martyrdom of King *Charles* I. All preach'd on particular Occaſions, before the State in the Cathedral of St. *Patrick's* and *Chriſt-Church*, *Dublin*; and collected into one Volume, by the Right Reverend Father in God *William Sheridan*, D. D. late Lord Biſhop of *Kilmore* and *Ardagh*, deprived.

Chriſtian

Christian Perfection, consisting in the Love of God; explained in several Letters to a Lady, &c. Written originally in *Italian* by Cardinal *Petrucci*; now now rendered into *English*: With an Account of the Author.

Characters and Criticisms upon the Ancient and Modern Orators, Poets, Painters, Musicians, Statuaries, and other Arts and Sciences; with an Heroick Poem in Blank Verse, entituled, The Age of *Lewis* the Great: Written originally in *French* by the Archbishop of *Cambray*, and made *English* by Captain *Bladen*.

Practical Phonography, or the new Art of rightly Spelling and Writing Words by the Sound thereof; and of rightly Sounding and Reading Words by the Sight thereof, applied to the *English* Tongue. Design'd for the Use of the Duke of *Glocester*. By *J. Jones*, M. D.

The Mysteries of Opium reveal'd, by Dr. *John Jones*, Chancellor of *Landaff*, a Member of the College of Physicians in *London*, and formerly Fellow of *Jesus College* in *Oxford*; Giving an Account of the Name, Mark, Choice, Effects, &c. of Opium.

Advertisements from *Parnassus*, written originally in *Italian*, by the Famous *Trajano Boccalini*, newly done into *English*, and adapted to the present Times: Together with the Author's Political Touchstone, never before Translated: And an Account of his Life, in 3 Vols By Capt. *Martin Bladen*.

Secretaria di Apollo, or Letters from *Apollo*, Historical and Political; directed to the most Eminent Princes, and Statesmen, and Politicians in the World, as well Ancient as Modern. With Curious Remarks on the Classick Authors, and other *Greek* and *Latin* Historians, in 2 Vols. By the Famous *Trajano Boccalini*, now done into *English* by Captain *Martin Bladen*.

THE END.